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Abstract
Since the 1960s, Western Europe has been host to a large Turkish immigrant community. While many such communities shift to the majority language in the space of a few generations, language maintenance is remarkably successful in this community. This is partially because of continuing immigration, but it is also typical of a transnational identity that characterizes many bilingual communities in modern Europe. The linguistic effects of this on-going contact situation include extensive codeswitching and slowly emerging changes in the lexicon and syntax. These are contained in a range of speech styles that show that in such modern migrant communities, the way in which different subgroups utilize their multilingual repertoire varies considerably, depending on background factors such as gender, locality, age, and socio-political identity.

1. Introduction
Turkish arrived in Western Europe in the 1960s, brought by migrant laborers, and continues to have a noticeable presence in Western Europe. The original days of labor migration almost 50 years behind us now, the language is still spoken widely, mostly because of continuing in-migration, language maintenance by the second and third generations, and the increasingly transnational identity that characterizes this as well as many other modern immigrant communities. The goal of this chapter is to provide a comprehensive overview of the linguistic work that has been carried out to date on Immigrant Turkish since the last such overview, Backus (2004).

While the linguistic study of this community initially focused primarily on second language acquisition (of the majority language), language choice patterns, and the structure and functions of codeswitching, the focus has shifted to two new topics in recent years: the ways in which speakers exploit the extensive linguistic repertoire at their disposal for identity-marking purposes, and the ways in which the language is slowly but surely changing in its new habitat.

The next section will provide a short review of the historical, social, and demographic context of the Turkish diaspora. Section 3 documents current language choice patterns in the community. It summarizes the fairly impressive body of work carried out on Turkish immigrants in recent years from the perspectives of interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. Section 4, finally, will deal with the immigrant language from a narrower linguistic perspective, emphasizing two issues: the degree to which the language is mixed with the majority language, and the degree to which it is changing.
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2. Historical and Demographical Developments

In Western Europe, Turkish is a very vital minority language. The contact history began with the arrival of the first migrant workers in the late 1950s, primarily in Germany. The two main reasons for immigration were the scarcity of workers in Western Europe and the high unemployment rate in Turkey at the time. Turkish workers were recruited in great numbers in several parts of Western Europe, but especially in Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Austria, Denmark, and Sweden. While the original outlook was a temporary stay, to facilitate a financial injection for a better future life in Turkey for the workers and their dependents, thoughts soon turned to a permanent stay in the country of immigration. Workers started to bring their families over, and in the 1970s, full-fledged immigrant communities started forming in the countries mentioned, with the new addition of France. The current situation is that these countries have sizable Turkish minorities, though their numerical importance differs from place to place. Germany has by far the biggest Turkish-origin population (about 2.8 million according to Woellert et al. (2009: 26–27), a combined effect of Germany having been a prime target of emigration and Germany being a large country, but relatively speaking, Turks are also fairly numerous in The Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, France, Switzerland, and Austria. Norway, Sweden, and the UK also have Turkish minorities, with the one in the UK having a slightly deviant profile. Many of the British Turks emigrated from Cyprus, a former British colony.

The Turkish-origin minority populations tend to occupy the lower reaches of the socio-economic scale in their host countries, as is not untypical of immigrant communities with roots in labor migration. Many live in urban centers, often concentrated in lower-class neighborhoods in which a large proportion of the population is of minority background. In most places, this includes people of varying backgrounds, not just Turkish. Only in Germany do there seem to be city quarters almost exclusively populated by people of Turkish origin. The specific situation differs from country to country, but by and large, the Turkish minorities have lower average income and higher rates of educational failure than the majority population. In most places, the situation has been improving steadily over the years, though educational policy sometimes works against the advancement of groups like the Turks, for instance because of the early tracking of children into higher and lower types of secondary education typical of Germany and Holland. This is particularly disadvantageous for children who grow up speaking non-standard varieties of the majority language, including local dialects, ethnolects, some emergent youth style, or a mixture of all these. Such children need more time for acquiring the standard academic variety of the language needed to get ahead in school. It is beyond the scope of this article, focusing as it does on linguistic issues, to do full justice to the diversity of demographic, social, educational, and political features that characterize the situation of this minority group in its various contexts; but as a general assessment, we offer that the social situation of the Turkish minorities in their host societies is not very good, but not dramatically bad either (see Pfaff 2003, Forthcoming, for recent descriptions of the situation in Germany, where there are currently attempts to reform the early tracking system). The political and media discourses of the majority societies are rife with complaints about the alleged poor command of the relevant majority language. This must be interpreted as concern about the overall low proficiency in the academic registers of the respective majority languages, not necessarily in the informal colloquial variety. In addition, the Turkish speakers themselves are often worried about the quality of their Turkish, which is often the subject of criticism during trips to Turkey, and by
parents and Turkish teachers in the diaspora communities. This concern can be interpreted as a sign that the language is changing (cf. Section 4).

While general media discourse, as well as much academic discourse, about this group treats it as a homogeneous community, there is considerable variation. Much of this article is taken up by demonstrating this variation. Bilingualism is widespread, in the sense that most members of the community speak both Turkish and the majority language of the country in which they live, but they differ in how well they speak these languages and in whether other languages play a role in their repertoire. Many of the minority members do in fact speak another language than Turkish as their native tongue, in most cases Kurdish. It is characteristic of the majority societies that they have tended to treat the whole group as ‘Turks’ and have provided services (including ‘mother tongue education’) only in Turkish, if at all.

Monolingual Turkish speakers exist among the first generation of migrant workers, who arrived with little education, the intention to return to Turkey after a few years, and with few opportunities for learning the majority language. Among children under four, there will also be many Turkish monolinguals, as Turkish tends to be the language of the home, though self-reported survey data in France and Germany show that increasingly the national languages are used alongside Turkish in many families (Aktnc1 et al. Forthcoming). Adult arrivals in more recent times tend to be the new spouses of members of the second or third generations: the degrees to which they come to participate in the socio-economic and cultural life of their newly adopted country, and learn the linguistic skills in the majority language needed for that, varies considerably. However, bilingualism is an obvious fact of life for most in the immigrant communities, and this is explored further in the next section.

3. Linguistic Repertoire and Language Choice Patterns

The exact degree to which the two or more languages play a role in everyday life varies considerably across individuals, as do abilities in and attitudes to Turkish and the majority language. While up until the mid-1990s, when a second generation was coming of age, the situation could largely be characterized as a fairly run-of-the-mill immigrant context, with a Turkish-dominant first generation and a bilingual second generation, raised with Turkish at home and the majority language at school, the picture has become a lot more complex since then. As with most modern immigrant groups (see, for instance, Koven 2007), it is characteristic of the Turkish groups in the modern urban societies of Western Europe that most individual speakers, particularly the younger generations, make use of a wide range of linguistic resources, needed to function in a great variety of recurrent social situations. These resources include, of course, Turkish, sometimes Kurdish, and the majority language, plus, sometimes, other languages, such as English, and registers of those languages. It cannot be said anymore that Turkish is clearly the in-group language, and the respective majority languages the outsider language.

This intra-community variation is perhaps the most important point to make here. While macro-sociolinguistic work on the community tends to take the group as a whole to compare it with other groups at a high level of aggregation, such as other minority groups and the majority group, ethnographic work on the Turkish immigrant community has documented quite a bit of variation within the community.

Research on language practices has tracked which language is used when, but has often found that speakers will not stick to just one language or variety. Codeswitching, it is often concluded, is the norm for everyday informal in-group conversation. However,
codeswitching is practiced in many different forms, and with differing intensity. Sometimes, enough cross-situational similarities exist for the appearance of certain styles of speaking, and importantly, features of these languages and registers. At other times, though, bilinguals combine individual features from varieties and languages in ways that contest norms, whether these are traditional or emergent. This has even led to the use of Turkish features by speakers who are not Turkish at all, indicating that in some social contexts, Turkish presence and prestige are strong enough not just for the language to be maintained but even for some knowledge of it to spread to other groups. This section will discuss some research results regarding these topics.

3.1. MAINTENANCE OF TURKISH AND LANGUAGE CHOICE PATTERNS

In general, Turkish seems to be well maintained by the immigrant groups. With many families containing one parent who has recently migrated from Turkey, it is no surprise that Turkish tends to be the language spoken in their homes. Some countries have now introduced laws that make it hard to bring a new spouse in from Turkey, in particular through national language proficiency requirements (Pfaff Forthcoming); it remains to be seen what effect this will have on language maintenance. Comparative studies of the ethnolinguistic vitality of minority languages routinely conclude that Turkish ranks near or at the top of the list: the language is used often and Turks believe it is important to try and avoid the loss of the language (Yağmur and Akınç 2003; Extra and Yağmur 2004). One important caveat must be mentioned, though: in many situations, community members do not stick to one of their languages: they codeswitch instead.

There are few systematic and large-scale studies based on direct observations of language choice patterns in the Turkish immigrant communities, which make it hard to estimate how much Turkish a speaker tends to speak on any given day, and how much speech is in the majority language. From what is available, it appears that Turkish by and large still functions as the language of home and family (see a series of studies by Erica Huls, e.g., Huls 2000; on language use within family discourse), and that its use in public varies enormously, from individual to individual and from social context to social context. Dorleijn and Nortier (2008) conducted an investigation into language attitudes as they can be gleaned from people’s postings on Internet forums in Holland. The Turkish contributors perceive their Turkish as something important and necessary. The authors use the metaphor of the inalienable ‘hand’ for the relationship of the Turkish speakers to their ancestral language, contrasting it with the much looser and mostly utilitarian bond between language and identity for an otherwise comparable minority, Moroccans, conceptualized through the metaphor of the alienable ‘glove’.

All in all, we may conclude that the Turkish community uses Turkish quite extensively, but it is much harder to assess the division of labor between Turkish and the majority language. It is clear that this varies enormously from individual to individual and within individuals across different situational settings. In the face of all this variation, looking for exact figures may not be the best course of action anyway; more important, one could argue, is it to know what choices speakers make in various kinds of situations, and which factors determine these choices.

The available data uniformly show a high degree of codeswitching in conversational data from this community, as long as these data are from everyday spontaneous interaction, and as long as there are no monolingual interlocutors present, as these tend to force a monolingual choice. Most studies draw the conclusion that codeswitching is the unmarked choice for everyday interaction. It must be noted, though, that most data are
from young second generation adults, a generation that may be more drawn to intensive mixing than older generations in migrant communities (cf. Franseschini 1998).

Note that these remarks refer to the spoken language. Turkish as an immigrant language is very much a spoken language, much less a written one. Though contexts for writing in Turkish exist, the degree to which Turks in Western Europe are used to writing in Turkish varies enormously. Some use it on the Internet, some increase their experience with an eye to career opportunities, some learn and practice it in school (countries differ in the degree to which they facilitate inclusion of Turkish in the educational curriculum, but the general development in the last decade has been toward the abolition of forms of bilingual education), but the number of occasions on which the average member of the community writes in Turkish is limited. Consequently, studies of the written Turkish of the immigrant communities are few (but see Schroeder 2007; Akıncı 2008; Dirim 2009; and Akıncı et al. Forthcoming). Productive and receptive use of written Turkish is probably on the increase, though, as exposure to Turkish Internet sites is growing.

3.2. CODESWITCHING OR A MIXED VARIETY?

Based on recordings of informal conversations involving Turkish speakers who were born and raised in Germany, Hinnenkamp (2003, 2005, 2008) studies the juxtaposition of Turkish and German elements in the speech of minority members. He finds that in some cases, alternation may be understood as pragmatically motivated local meaning-making, but there are also many cases of alternation that ‘do not have a comprehensible logical function at the particular place where they occur’ (Hinnenkamp 2003, 26). Hinnenkamp (2005) develops the term ‘blurred genre’ for such behavior and stresses that it is a language variety in its own right. However, this does not mean that speakers are not aware of the mixed nature of their speech. The terms chosen by its users to describe this style, such as ‘gemischt sprechen’ or ‘karşılık konuşmak’, both meaning ‘speak in a mixed way’, suggest that speakers actively combine their resources. The general picture thus seems to be that mixed speech is the joint result of intentional choices and largely unintentional entrenched behavior. But how much of which? The answer to this question depends on how reliably we can distinguish between such intentional and unintentional choices. The literature on Immigrant Turkish does not provide the definitive answer to this difficult methodological problem of interactional sociolinguistics, but it does provide some useful insights. The impression that it has become the normal way of speaking is voiced often in the literature on this community (cf. Jørgensen 2004b). However, at the same time, it is not the case that everybody mixes, and it is not done the same way by every speaker.

An important body of work carried out in Mannheim provides an interesting snapshot of intra-community variability in speech styles (see Kallmeyer and Keim 2003; Keim 2003, 2004). Three different styles of speaking among the Turkish adolescents in just that one German city are documented, and each style is associated with what could be called a different outlook on life. Such variation has not been studied in any detail elsewhere in the diaspora, but the Mannheim groups certainly seem familiar to observers of Turkish immigrants throughout Europe. The researchers used the groups’ own labels: Powergirls, Europatürken (‘European Turks’), and Unmündern (‘the Voiceless’). By far, the best described of these groups is the Powergirls (Keim 2007a,b, 2008): self-confident teenage girls and young women, who distance themselves from the generation of their parents, perceived as conservative and unwilling to become part of German society, and from the German majority, which they perceive as hostile to immigrants. The Europatürken are
young, predominantly male, highly educated Turks who assume the role of the professional intermediary between Turkey and Europe; the Unmündigen, similarly, are highly educated, politically aware, advocates of the rights of migrants (so their chosen moniker is presumably meant ironically; cf. Aslan 2005 and Cindark 2005 for descriptions of these groups). As important as this picture of variation is, the numerically strongest subgroup was not even covered by the Mannheim investigations: the mostly male high school dropouts that opt not to be part of German society at all. These are the so-called ‘ghetto’ kids who feature in most public discourse about the troublesome ethnic youth in modern urban Western Europe. Another sizable segment of the community that awaits further study is formed by young people with a strong Islam identity.

Groups like these exist not just in the city of Mannheim, of course. They can be seen as broadly representative of variation in the Turkish immigrant community in general. Orientation to Turkey or Western Europe, to assimilation or ethnic pride, to religious identity or secularism, produces variations on this constant theme. The important lessons for sociolinguists are that, first, these groups exist with communicative styles to match and, second, that language is only part of the complex of cultural behavior that groups use to distinguish themselves from others (cf. Mendoza-Denton 2008).

The Mannheim project has documented the communicative styles of these three groups of Turkish speakers, especially of the Powergirls (Keim 2007a). Keim consistently analyzes the linguistic variation of the members of this group as a factor closely related to their style, i.e., a set of behaviors and attitudes that reflects their relations to others. In particular, their relations to mainstream majority German peers on the one hand and to the parent generation of the Turkish-speaking minority on the other hand are associated with specific behaviors, including linguistic choices. The Powergirls alternate between monolingual German, monolingual Turkish, and a ‘bilingual mode’ in which they employ both Turkish and German features to varying degrees. Importantly, it is not easy to reify these modes as three different varieties in their linguistic repertoire. The context, or sometimes just the mood of the conversation, prompts speakers to present themselves as more or less bilingual, more or less German, or more or less Turkish. With age and increasing educational level, the Powergirls develop a comfortable ‘monolingual German’ variety. In in-group interaction, however, they retain their own style of communication that is a complex mixture of features from ‘Mannheim German’, the local variety of German they have grown up with, the dialectal Turkish inherited from their parents, and their ‘Mischsprache’ (‘Mixlingo’, Keim 2007a: 234).

Extensive illustration of such bilingual styles of speaking can also be found in the reports written on the Danish Køge Project, a longitudinal project that has followed a group of Turkish speaking grade school children from grade 1 through grade 9 (see Holmen and Jørgensen 2000 and Jørgensen Forthcoming for overviews; Turan 1999 is a collection of transcribed data from the project, and Jørgensen 2004a contains a comprehensive bibliography). In several volumes (Jørgensen 2003; Dabelsteen and Jørgensen 2004, Lytra and Jørgensen 2008), results from this project are compared with those of studies of Turkish elsewhere in Europe, mostly with a focus on pragmatics. The bulk of the data are transcribed conversations among the students, in varying settings and with varying participants. The individual participants were again interviewed and recorded when they were in their mid-twenties (Møller and Jørgensen 2008).

One finding has been that the relative strength of Turkish and Danish in the speech of the students does not develop in a straightforward way, but is influenced by group dynamics. In their mid-twenties, the participants were found to use more Turkish among
themselves than they did at the end of primary school. Particularly, those who are parents have reported an increased frequency of Turkish in the family.

3.3. POLY-LINGUAL LANGUAGING

Interactional sociolinguistics has developed a keen interest in the often intentional choices speakers also often make, to achieve certain communicative effects, and as the sociolinguistic study of Turkish as an immigrant language is dominated by interactional sociolinguists, much has been uncovered about the choices members of the Turkish minority communities make in their everyday discourse. The concept of *poly-lingual language* has been developed to cover such practices. Use of the term ‘languaging’ to describe the linguistic behavior of human beings as generally active and intentional was proposed by Jørgensen (2004b) and finds support from, among others, Hinnenkamp (2008) and Rehbein and Karakoç (2004). ‘Poly-lingualism’ (Jørgensen Forthcoming) is a term for the phenomenon that speakers use linguistic resources from a wide range of different ‘languages’ and do so without respecting the monolingualism norms that are so strong in western societies.

An interesting finding of the Køge project has been that the participants develop increasingly complex patterns of language choice in their mutual conversations. The resources available to the young speakers are not limited to Turkish and Danish. English items are present at an early time, and gradually French, German, Sealand Danish (the local dialect), mock Danish-Swedish, and many more appear in the speech of the participants. This is described as increasingly integrated poly-lingualism, as they use features from all these resources, often very playfully, to achieve various communicative effects. In doing so, these informants demonstrate the poly-lingual languaging typical of late modern urban youth.

The sheer presence of Turkish and its covert prestige have led to its use outside of the Turkish community, providing further evidence for the decreasing validity of the simple social and linguistic dichotomy of majority versus minority, or Western European versus Turkish. A study by (Dirim and Auer 2000, 2004, see also references there) focuses on the simultaneous use of Turkish and German by urban youth in multiethnic sectors of the German city of Hamburg. Young speakers of many different backgrounds, including Afghan, Persian, Bosnian, and German, use Turkish features, sometimes just emblematically or symbolically (i.e., they use some ethnically loaded words), at other times with near-native command.

This phenomenon has attracted much attention in recent years, since the publication of Rampton (2005 [1995]), who coined the term ‘crossing’ for it. Rampton found that adolescent speakers use features, which they are not generally thought to have easy access to, but only in certain circumstances, namely when everyday routines are temporarily suspended: when the speakers are claimed to be in a state of ‘liminoidity’. However, Dirim and Auer (2004) argue that the use of Turkish by non-Turks in Hamburg is not crossing in Rampton’s sense of the word, because this usage also takes place in the presence of people of Turkish origin and is not used to style themselves as something they are not. As with the Mannheim *Powergirls* and the young Danish–Turkish bilingual children, the very fact that the monolingualism norms are systematically violated may be the most basic characteristic of at least a considerable part of the young speakers’ in-group behavior. The young speakers who use Turkish elements are said to have a threefold orientation (‘Orientierung’, Dirim and Auer 2004, 44–45), and any one of these may play a role at specific times: Turkish-ness (testifying to its covert prestige), urban outsider
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culture, and urban youth culture. In the latter case, Turkish is important only because it has come to be dominant among the minorities in places such as Hamburg, and by implication in the multiethnic networks in the relevant areas.

A similar social strategy has been found in the use of non-standard varieties of German by Turkish adolescents, in Eksner’s (2006) ethnographic study of the use and attitudes toward ‘stylized Turkish German’ by male adolescents in Berlin. They use it as a discourse style to mark toughness and aggressiveness on the streets.

There is some discussion as to what the status of the various Turkish and German features is, but the consensus is that the poly-lingual language use of late modern urban youth has social stylistic meanings. The speakers are poly-lingual languagers.

4. Linguistic Effects of Language Contact

Usage of two or more languages in everyday life always has consequences for the languages involved, as they undergo changes in their lexicon and structure. This section documents some of the changes that have been attested in the immigrant varieties of Turkish. Section 4.1 deals with lexical change, as visible in the familiar phenomenon of codeswitching; Section 4.2 presents findings about the less immediately visible structural or grammatical changes.

4.1. CODESWITCHING

The first thing linguists started noticing about Turkish in the immigration setting was the impact of the other language on the word stock. Turkish as spoken in any Western European country contains words from the local majority language: a few lexical gap fillers in the early years, and a great flood of loanwords soon thereafter. These surface in bilingual speech as what is commonly called codeswitching, though we should point out straight away that the habit in bilingualism research is to label all foreign lexical material ‘codeswitching’, putting aside the question which of those are fully entrenched in the language as established loanwords, and which have been literally taken from the other language at the moment of speaking.

The linguistic literature on codeswitching involving Western European Turkish was summarized in Backus (2004). While the way in which foreign words are integrated into Turkish is fairly well understood, thanks to a rich body of data, very little is known about the degree to which foreign words are integrated into the mental lexicons of Turkish immigrants. For example, we do not know which words from Western European languages are in use in all or most of the immigrant communities, and we have no idea how many words in general can be considered established loanwords in Immigrant Turkish, let alone which ones. Nevertheless, Turkish–Dutch codeswitching offers evidence for the two main types of language mixing found elsewhere as well: insertion and alternation. Alternation, in which clauses and sentences fully in one language alternate, frequently forms the database on the basis of which the work outlined in Section 3 is carried out.

Insertion generally concerns using content words from one language, mostly nouns and verbs, in clauses that are grammatically clearly in the other language (cf. Myers-Scotton 2002). In the immigrant data, Turkish functions as the base language most of the time. Nouns are generally fully integrated into the Turkish morphosyntactic system, meaning they are case-marked appropriately (i.e., as the clause they appear in requires) and can appear with any functional morpheme that can be found in fully Turkish noun phrases,
such as the plural suffix, possessives, copulas, demonstratives, and the indefinite article, cf. the Turkish–Dutch example in (1), from Backus (2005).

(1) Nachttrein-i orta Randstad-da dolașt-ı duruyor
night.train-POSS there Randstad-LOC going.around keeps
“The night train keeps going around there in the Randstad [=metropolitan area in Western Holland]”

Verbs have been of particular interest to students of Immigrant Turkish and colleagues in the wider world of codeswitching studies, because Turkish is a textbook example of a language that applies the so-called ‘do strategy’, meaning that foreign verbs are morphologically accommodated when they are used in Turkish clauses. Virtually, all foreign verbs documented in Immigrant Turkish data are accompanied by an immediately following Turkish ‘auxiliary’, usually yap-, and sometimes et-, both verbs meaning ‘do’, as in (2), in which both the direct object and the verb are from Dutch. Many languages around the world employ this strategy (cf. Backus 2009).

(2) kim-e smoesje verzin-nen yap-t-ı-n lan
who-DAT excuse make.up-INF did.PAST-2SG man
“hey man, who did you make up an excuse for?”

However, it is not just single words that get inserted: we also find inserted constituents, phrases, and other longer stretches of material from the other language. The Turkish–Dutch example below includes an adjective–noun collocation and a prepositional phrase. In this example, only the existential predicate, var, is Turkish.

(3) Ja, verkorte opleiding-de var van één jaar, twee jaar
yes shortened program-too there.is of one year, two year
“yeah, there’s also a short program of one or two years”

Of further interest is the finding that many of these inserted chunks are formulaic in nature. This suggests that the bilingual speaker is not really piecing together complex grammatical patterns from two languages, as is often claimed, but instead takes these chunks whole from memory. Insertional codeswitching, in this alternative perspective, is not the combination of base language grammatical patterns with embedded language content words, but the combination of stored chunks that happen to originate in two languages. Such data have in turn been used to argue that we indeed store relatively large chunks of language in our mental lexicon, alongside the single words that are obviously also stored there (Backus 2003). As such, bilingual CS data take their place alongside many other sources for this conclusion (Wray 2008).

4.2. STRUCTURAL CHANGE

While by the time of writing Backus (2004), the picture for codeswitching was relatively clear, with not too much variation apparent between the various immigrant communities in Western Europe, very little systematic work had been carried out on the other main linguistic contact effect found in minority languages spoken by bilingual populations (cf. Thomason 2001): contact-induced structural change. In the meantime, some studies have appeared that require an update on this point. Both in Tilburg (The Netherlands) and in Hamburg (Germany), relatively large-scale research projects have been carried out that focused squarely on the question to what degree, and if so, how, Turkish grammar had changed, or is changing, in the immigrant context. The Tilburg studies (Doğruöz and Backus 2007, 2009;
Dogruöz 2008) have focused on the overall degree of change, and on word order and the use of subject pronouns in particular; the Hamburg group has carried out detailed investigations of the discourse marking system (Baumgarten et al. 2007; Herkenrath 2007; Herkenrath et al. 2003; Karakoç 2007, Rehbein 2001, and Rehbein and Karakoç 2004). A methodological feature characterizing both sets of studies is the explicit comparison of two data sets: samples of immigrant speech and samples of speech collected in the regions in Turkey from which the original immigrants came. Special mention must be made of the work by Lars Johanson. Along with his students at Mainz, he has developed a model of contact effects, the Code Copying Model (Johanson 2002), which has proven very useful in understanding the common nature of lexical and grammatical contact phenomena. This model, while aspiring to universal status, has been developed on the basis of contact data involving various Turkic languages, including the varieties of Turkish spoken in Western Europe.

At the risk of simplifying too much, we can say that two main conclusions have been reached by this work. The first is that the degree of syntactic influence differs from one syntactic domain to the other but that overall it is best characterized as slight. Second, there are many cases of cross-linguistic influence in the data that are lexical in nature in the sense that they are more or less literal translations of multiword units of the majority language. The first conclusion is discussed in Section 4.2.1; loan translations are the subject of Section 4.2.2.

4.2.1. Syntactic Change

Dogruöz and Backus (2009) conclude that in the Dutch Turkish data they investigated, there was very little syntactic influence of Dutch on Turkish. Both word order and the use of subject pronouns, two aspects of Turkish syntax thought to be sensitive to contact effects, were virtually indistinguishable from Turkish as spoken in Turkey. That does not mean there were no structural differences between the immigrant and the non-immigrant varieties at all: it is just that they were relatively few in number and spread over many different aspects of the language. It is not the case that entire subsystems, or constructions, were seen to be giving way to a Dutch-style way of encoding. Quantitative analysis revealed that <1% of all relevant environments exhibited what the researchers referred to as ‘unconventionality’, i.e., a deviation from Turkey–Turkish norms. It turned out that most, but not all, of the unconventional cases that were so identified could indeed be attributed to Dutch influence. At the same time, it is clear that being cut off from the norms of everyday speech in Turkey could also play a role in bringing about ways of speaking frowned upon in Turkey, and therefore much less in evidence there. An example of unconventional word order occurs in (4). Here, the immediately preverbal position of the direct object and the post-verbal position of the locative phrase combine, for a Turkey–Turkish speaker, to place a focus interpretation on the legs and to background the position in the air, a meaning not intended by the speaker. To convey the intended meaning, with focus on the position of the legs in the air, a Turkey–Turkish speaker would place the locative phrase before the verb. Not surprisingly, the Immigrant Turkish word order resembles Dutch word order, where the locative phrase would also come last.

(4) (Context: In this part of the conversation, speaker Diren was talking about a dance class she took as a child. She then utters the following remark)

sonra bacak tutuluyordu havada sonra.
then leg they.were.held in.the.air then.
‘and then you held your legs in the air’

(Turkey–Turkish: sonra bacak havada tutuluyordu)
The Hamburg studies focus especially on structures above clause level, such as subordination, discourse connectivity, and discourse marking in the immigrant varieties. Karakoç (2007), for example, studied the degree to which Turkish children in Germany differed from their peers in Turkey in their use of finite verb inflection to structure connected discourse, by analyzing children’s retellings of the Snow White fairy tale (that was first read out to them from a picture book). By and large, results support the interpretation that bilingual children acquire a slightly different system and that that system shows effects of both attrition and German influence. Bilinguals use a smaller range of forms and make limited use of the Turkish tendency to use one tense as the anchor tense in narratives (see also Rehbein and Karakoç 2004: 142); instead, they make more use of deictic temporal adverbs (e.g., *o zaman* ‘then’, *ondan sonra* ‘and then’; also see Baumgarten et al. 2007: 277). Dirim (2009) reports on other emerging grammatical features in the written Turkish texts of adolescents.

It is likely that all results reported on in this section will be contradicted to some extent by future studies. This is because, overall, the amount of data that has been analyzed can be considered fairly small. Presumably, the next decade will see increased attention to these facts and replication studies in various locales. This work is needed, anyway, to arrive at a stage where we have enough evidence to say whether or not particular constructions that are unconventional from the perspective of Turkey–Turkish are widespread enough to allow the conclusion that they are the norm of a new variety of Turkish. These desired analyses should also take into account a host of other syntactic aspects of Turkish that have been the subject of limited attention (also see Cindark and Aslan 2004).

4.2.2. Loan Translations
The second major conclusion of recent work on structural change in the immigrant varieties of Turkish has been that, while abstract syntactic structure has not proven very vulnerable to structural influence, the search for unconventionality turned up much more at a more concrete level: what we may call, following Owens (1996), ‘idiomatic structure’. Many expressions are used that seem odd from the viewpoint of Turkey–Turkish. These are divided over many different syntactic configurations; what they have in common, though, is that they tend to betray lexical influence from the majority language, while not violating Turkish syntax. Many of these cases can be seen as loan translations (see Backus and Dorleijn 2009 for a more detailed account). Once more, while the examples below are from Turkish–Dutch contact, as this phenomenon has been studied most intensively in The Netherlands, similar examples can be found in all other countries. What the examples share is that a Dutch expression has been the model for the one used in the contact variety of Turkish, which has been produced through a more or less faithful translation. The result is a verb–object combination in the first example, and a construction for the intensification of an adjective in the second example, which are unfamiliar (or ‘wrong’) from the perspective of Turkey–Turkish. Such expressions can easily get conventionalized in the immigrant varieties because they are under the radar: as all the words involved are Turkish, people often have no idea that the combination is not used in Turkey. The second example also shows that sometimes it is hard to say whether the contact phenomenon is purely lexical (unconventional use of the lexical item *kötü* ‘bad’) or syntactic (innovative intensifying construction); in fact, Backus and Dorleijn (2009) conclude that loan translation and structural borrowing shade off into one another. If this can be substantiated further in future work, this suggests previously separately discussed contact phenomena can be unified under a common heading; in turn, this would
lend support to linguistic theories that do away with the strict boundary between lexicon and syntax, a hypothesis common in the various branches of Cognitive Linguistics (cf. Taylor 2002).

(5) Ben okul-da bir sene Fransızca yap-tı-m.
I school-LOC one year French do-PAST.1SG
“I studied French for a year at high school”.
Dutch: Ik heb een jaar Frans gedaan op school (literally: I have one year French done at school)
TR-Turkish: Ben okulda bir sene Fransızca oku-du-m (literally: I at.school one year French read-PAST.1SG)

(6) Bir sene açaip kötü stak-tı burast
One year very bad warm-PAST.3SG here
“One year, it was incredibly warm here”.
Dutch: één jaar was het hier heel erg warm (literally: one year was it here very bad warm)
TR-Turkish: bir sene açaip stak-tı burast (literally: one year very warm-PAST.3SG here)

5. Conclusion

This article has documented recent advances made in the study of Turkish as a minority language in Western Europe. It has sketched a situation of increasing intra-community variation, as members differ considerably in the degree to which they use Turkish in their everyday lives, and in the way in which they respond to being part of an ethnic minority and to being bilingual. Studies have uncovered interesting facts about especially language choice patterns (Section 3), codeswitching (Section 4.1) and structural changes (Section 4.2). However, in contemplating these individual facts, one should not lose sight of what is perhaps the most significant finding of the Mannheim studies discussed in Section 3: variation comprises more than this. The three groups distinguished in Mannheim use distinct conversational styles, and language choice is just one of the constitutive elements of such styles, in addition to other characteristics that have often been shown to be markers of belonging to particular communities of practice (cf. Mendoza-Denton 2008), such as discourse organization, the tone of voice in which conversations are typically held, turn-taking patterns, as well as purely behavioral features.
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Notes
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Abbreviations used in the examples: DAT, dative; INF, infinitive; LOC, locative; PAST, past tense; POSS, possessive; SG, singular.
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