Yeşim Sevinç*

Language maintenance and shift under pressure: Three generations of the Turkish immigrant community in the Netherlands

DOI 10.1515/ijsl-2016-0034

Abstract: Drawing on questionnaire and interview data, this study explores the process of language maintenance and shift across three generations of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands. It compares three generations of Turkish-Dutch bilinguals by examining age and place of language learning, self-rated language proficiency, and language choices in six domains (home, school, work, friends, media and leisure time activities, and cognitive activities). Furthermore, it investigates bilinguals' experiences, motivations for learning languages and attitudes towards bilingualism. Findings suggest that following the typical pattern of language shift described by Mario Saltarelli and Susan Gonzo in 1977, language history, self-rated language proficiency and current language practices of third-generation children differ from those of first- and second-generation bilinguals. Consequently, possible language shift among third-generation bilinguals causes socioemotional pressure about maintaining the Turkish language, triggering intergenerational tensions in Turkish immigrant families. At the same time, the perceived need to shift to Dutch for social and economic reasons causes immigrant children to experience tensions and ambiguities in the linguistic connections between the family and other social domains (e. g. school, friendship). The findings evidence that the Turkish immigrant community in the Netherlands may no longer be as linguistically homogeneous as once observed. The dissolution of homogeneity can be a sign of social change in which maintaining the Turkish language has become a challenge, whereas speaking Dutch is a necessity of life in the Netherlands.

Keywords: language shift, three generations, Turkish immigrant community in the Netherlands, language tension, socioemotional pressure

*Corresponding author: Yeşim Sevinç, University of Oslo, Center for Multilingualism in Society Across the Lifespan (MultiLing), Oslo, Norway, E-mail: yesim.sevinc@iln.uio.no

1 Introduction

Immigrant communities can experience tension between language maintenance and language shift, influenced by countless imperceptible linguistic choices. Language maintenance occurs when immigrants' heritage language (HL)¹ continues to be used over successive generations (Fishman 1972). Conversely, language shift occurs when immigrants progressively replace their HL with the language of the socially or economically dominant group (Fishman 1972), majority language (ML). This process of language shift advances from generation to generation, yet its speed varies from one community to another depending on linguistic and social factors. Saltarelli and Gonzo (1977) clarify that the first generation is bilingual with a strong dominance of the mother tongue, the second generation is bilingual with a dominance of one language or with a balanced situation, the third generation is bilingual with a dominance of ML, and the fourth generation only masters the ML. This study investigates language maintenance and shift in three generations of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands, the third generation of which is currently reaching adulthood. It examines the possible change that occurs in language history, self-rated language proficiency and language use (i. e. Turkish and Dutch) across the generations and the tension between language maintenance and shift in this community. It should be noted that the concept of "language tension" used in this study refers to the potential strain experienced between a socioemotional need to maintain the HL (Canagarajah 2008; Oh and Fuligni 2010) and an instrumental pressure for full transition to the ML (Portes and Hao 2002). "Language tension" does not view bilingualism negatively but rather as a challenge. While the advantages of bilingualism are often greater than the disadvantages (see Grosjean 1994), challenges that bilingual families face in an immigrant context (i. e. tension, conflict, ambiguities) are undoubtedly worth discussing (Baker 2000; Goulbourne et al. 2010).

1.1 The process of language maintenance and shift

The outcome of a language contact situation (i. e. proficiency, language dominance, language maintenance and shift) is determined by the interplay of both linguistic and social factors (Gal 1979; Thomason 2008). However, linguists and sociologists often implement different criteria when investigating these

¹ The term "heritage language" in this study is used synonymously with "immigrant minority language".

outcomes. Some linguists, for instance, argue the outcome is determined by the age when language learning begins, while sociologists contend it is predicted by motivational factors and exposure to the languages in societal contexts (Stevens 1999). This study considers the significance of age of acquisition of languages (AoA) and age of arrival in the host country (AoAr) as it is reflected in different generations, but it emphasizes a number of other social and cultural factors recognized as significant in cases of language maintenance and shift (Gal 1979).

AoA and AoAr affect how we delineate between early (i. e. child) or late (i. e. adult) bilinguals. Numerous studies suggest that early bilinguals have certain advantages over late ones in language learning (DeKeyser et al. 2010). Early bilinguals may be able to construct two grammatical systems, becoming proficient in both languages (Romaine 1995). Nevertheless, the degree of proficiency and the pattern of dominance may change over a lifetime due to changes in language use (Bybee 2010). For instance, if bilinguals begin using one language more than the other, the less used language, in most cases the HL, will inevitably become weaker (MacLeod and Stoel-Gammom 2010). Therefore, other factors such as the frequency with which a language is used, educational attainment in the ML, social and motivational factors, and family members' proficiency are vital to consideration in studies of language maintenance and shift in an immigrant context (Valdés et al. 2006; De Klerk 2000).

The fate of language maintenance or shift is determined in part by language choice patterns (i. e. how much and in which domains the HL and the ML are used) (Labov 1972). Several studies on language choice in social settings have adopted the notion of “social network” (Milroy 1980; Li 1994; Lanza and Svendsen 2007; Hlavac 2013) to capture domains such as “family”, “friends”, “work”, “commerce and shops” and “media”. In examinations of immigrant languages, many studies (Hulsen et al. 2002; Stoessel 2002) conclude that having social networks within the host community can stimulate language shift. However, due to social and cultural differences between the ethnic and host communities, immigrants may fail to construct social networks that include members of the host group, and preserve their social contact and bond within their ethnic group, in which the HL is often spoken. By reducing the distance between immigrants and their home country (e. g. through media and internet), globalization can also support language maintenance efforts of immigrant communities (Grenoble and Whaley 2006). In such cases, HL maintenance can be sustained over an extended period of time.

Closely related to language choice and practices, the power relationship between heritage and majority languages affects the function and dominance of these languages over the course of heritage speakers' lives. Thus, even bilinguals who are equally proficient in both languages can encounter sociolinguistic

or emotional pressures that may cause one of the languages to become more dominant (Montrul 2013). This is particularly evident among immigrant populations whose language use, proficiency and the degree of linguistic maintenance or shift are influenced by sociopolitical conditions in the host country and sociocultural issues, namely their attitudes and their general value system (underpinned by their identity, culture, religion and so forth) (Edwards 1984). For instance, immigrant families may be more likely to maintain their HL if they perceive it as an important aspect of their ethnic identity (Kang and Kim 2012). In such cases, language shift can lead to intergenerational tension within families (see Portes and Rumbaut 2001), perhaps mostly when it is associated with identity shift. Thus, the pressure for immigrants to join mainstream society and the need to resolve intergenerational conflict may lead these families to forego language maintenance (Canagarajah 2008). It is also important to note that different immigrant communities may face different language maintenance experiences due to variations in their general value systems.

In social networks, bilinguals' gender is also influential, because males and females often participate in divergent social environments, which impacts immigrants' levels of language proficiency. Investigating the complex interrelationship between gender and language learning, a series of early studies in the field of SLA indicate that women have superior language abilities compared to men (e. g. Ellis 1994). As opposed to this approach, other scholars have increasingly adopted a framework that focuses on the role of context, power relations, ethnic, social, and cultural diversity of gendered identities and linguistic practices (Piller and Pavlenko 2009; Sharma 2011).

Finally, in addition to social domains, language choice in cognitive activities such as “emotional expressions”, “mental calculations”, and “inner speech” can tell us much about language competence and dominance (Dewaele 2004). The link between language dominance, language preference and emotional/mental representation is discussed in various studies (Pavlenko 2014). The shift in dominance from the HL is linked to a similar decline in the use of the HL for the expression of emotions, inner speech and mental calculations (Dewaele 2004).

1.2 The Turkish immigrant context in the Netherlands

As part of general labour migration to Western Europe, the 1960s and early 1970s witnessed a movement of Turkish immigrants to the Netherlands. Although intended to be short-term, this migration was followed by family reunifications and migration marriages, substantially increasing the Turkish

population in the Netherlands, which today is among the highest in the EU countries (Milewski and Hamel 2010). Different components of language maintenance and shift (e. g. language proficiency, language choice, attitudes towards languages and cultures) have been investigated in the first and second generations of the Turkish community in the Netherlands through questionnaires on language skills, language use and choice patterns (cf. Vedder and Virta 2005; Extra and Yağmur 2010). By means of conversational data (Doğruöz and Backus 2009), judgement tasks and controlled experiments (Doğruöz and Gries 2012; Sevinç 2014), several studies have illustrated that the Turkish spoken in the Netherlands differs from the Turkish spoken in Turkey both lexically (code-switching, loan translations) and structurally (Dutch interference). These studies agree that a gradual language shift seems to be occurring in this community. Furthermore, findings based on a large-scale survey home language survey Extra and Yağmur (2004) have shown that even among the second and third generation, Turkish is the most vital immigrant language in the European context. They have also revealed that Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands view their HL as a core marker of ethnic identity, and are motivated to maintain it over generations.

As noted by Extra and Yağmur (2010), first-generation immigrants are Turkish-born individuals with ties mostly to other members of the Turkish community in the Netherlands, and they ascribe a high value to maintaining the Turkish language. They frequently visit Turkey and watch Turkish TV channels. Within this population, the HL tends to be the dominant language and there is a strong commitment to Turkish identity and culture (Backus 2013). “On the whole, they have functional fluency in Dutch and the number of high achievers is relatively small” (Yılmaz and Schmid 2015: 124).

For second-generation bilinguals, Dutch was often the weaker language during their early years in school due to limited use of Dutch at home (Leseman 2000). In this context, most Turkish-Dutch children started to learn Dutch at school age (Blom 2010). According to Driessen et al. (2002), even after two years in school, when these children have developed their Dutch skills, they still lag behind their Dutch classmates. However, after several years of systematic exposure at school, as Extra and Yağmur (2004) suggest, Dutch becomes their dominant language. In this respect, compared to first-generation immigrants, second-generation bilinguals have much higher Dutch proficiency, much higher ratings for Dutch vitality and they also choose to speak Dutch in interaction with others more often (Yağmur 2009).

To a remarkable extent, second-generation bilinguals still choose spouses from Turkey (Yağmur 2009) and their children are currently forming the third generation of this community. In the current study, the first generation thus

includes two types of immigrants: those who migrated to the Netherlands through labour migration in the 1960s and early 1970s, and those who migrated through marriage migration after marrying a second-generation Turkish spouse. The term “second generation” refers to Turkish people who were born in the Netherlands or arrived before the age of five and started school there.² The term “third generation” refers to those bilinguals who have one second-generation Turkish-Dutch bilingual parent and one Turkish-born parent who came to the Netherlands through marriage migration.

2 The current study

No study to date has compared three generations of this community. Sevinç (2014), a previous pilot study (n=14), has suggested that with one second-generation parent, the Turkish language dominance at home decreases substantially in the daily life of third-generation bilinguals. A larger sample is thus required to consolidate those findings and other factors influencing language maintenance and shift of the community need examination. Methodologically, there is also a shortage of research that adopts an interdisciplinary approach that could give voice to Turkish immigrants’ experiences in the Netherlands. Therefore, by pursuing an intergenerational comparison and combining questionnaire and interview data, this study aims to explore the following research questions. First, is there evidence of the possibility of language shift among third-generation bilinguals as described in the three-generation language shift pattern? Second, is this shift also visible in their attitudes towards languages, motivations for learning languages, opinions about language choice, and immigrant experiences?

² According to *Statistics Netherlands* (2000), which qualified second-generation immigrants based on the demographic (birthplace) criterion, the second generation was still young (more than 80 percent is under 20), and the third generation of Turkish origin was therefore rather small in number (Alders and Keij 2001). Unlike *Statistics Netherlands*, the current study follows sociolinguistic rather than demographic terminology: the immigrant parents are the first generation, the children second, and the grandchildren are the third (Silva-Corvalán 1994). Instead of birthplace, it employs a sociological criterion to classify the second generation, i. e. whether or not children started their school careers in the Netherlands. Therefore, the meanings of the terms second and third generation as they are used in this and other work in contact linguistics are not always identical to how they are defined in official demographic statistics.

2.1 Participants

2.1.1 Questionnaire respondents

Table 1 provides demographic information for questionnaire participants, 116 Turkish-Dutch bilinguals³ (76 female, 40 male); 45 were first-generation bilinguals,

Table 1: Questionnaire respondents’ demographic information.

	1st generation (n = 45)		2nd generation (n = 30)		3rd generation (n = 41)	
Country of birth	NL	TR	NL	TR	NL	TR
	–	100 %	64 %	36 %	100 %	–
Age (years)	Mean	SD (range)	Mean	SD (range)	Mean	SD (range)
	50	11.7 (32–85)	33	7.3 (20–42)	15	2.8 (11–21)
Gender						
Female (n = 76)	32		20		24	
Male (n = 40)	13		10		17	
Educational background						
Elementary school in Turkey	56 %					
High school in Turkey	27 %					
BA in Turkey	17 %					
High school in the Netherlands			53 %		19 %	
BA in the Netherlands			20 %			
(Student) MA			10 %			
(Student) Elementary school					28 %	
(Student) High school					54 %	
(Student) University			17 %		9 %	

3 Questionnaires were completed by 131 participants. Ten individuals were excluded since they acquired Kurdish or Arabic before Turkish and Dutch, and they self-identified as non-Turkish and non-Dutch. The other five participants were excluded since they were never exposed to Turkish because they had a Dutch father (and a Turkish mother) and they strongly objected to being identified as a member of the Turkish community. For the purpose of the study, only those who self-identified as a member of the Turkish community were included.

30 were second generation, and 41 were third generation. They were recruited in Amsterdam, Nijmegen and Rotterdam, Dutch cities with a sizeable Turkish population. Emphasis was placed on reaching third-generation immigrants from different socioeconomic backgrounds. Using a snowball sampling technique, the potential respondents were also requested to ask their family members to participate in the study.

Participants ranged in age from 11 to 85. Of the first-generation bilinguals completing the questionnaire, the majority (56 percent) completed elementary school and 27 percent completed high school in Turkey while 17 percent graduated from university in Turkey. A greater proportion of second-generation bilinguals was born in the Netherlands (64 percent), the rest (36 percent) came to the Netherlands before they reached school age. They held either a high school diploma (53 percent) or a university degree (20 percent) from a Dutch institution, while others (27 percent) were currently enrolled in a higher education program. All third-generation bilinguals had one second-generation parent: 52 percent had one parent born in the Netherlands while the rest had one parent born in Turkey and came to the Netherlands before school age. Among third-generation bilinguals, 19 percent were high school graduates and the majority of them were currently students: elementary school (28 percent), high school (54 percent) and university (9 percent).

2.1.2 Interviewees

Interviews were conducted with 30 individuals (21 female, 9 male) who had completed the questionnaires before; 6 were first-generation bilinguals, 8 were second generation, and 16 were third generation (Table 2). Third-generation bilinguals would play the primary role in the process of language shift.

Table 2: Interviewees’ demographic information.

	1st generation (n = 6)		2nd generation (n = 8)		3rd generation (n = 16)	
Country of birth	NL	TR	NL	TR	NL	TR
	–	100 %	100 %	–	100 %	–
Age (years)	Mean	SD (range)	Mean	SD (range)	Mean	SD (range)
	41	4.0 (33–43)	26	1.6 (24–28)	14	2.2 (12–19)
Gender						
Female (n = 21)	6		8		7	
Male (n = 9)	–		–		9	

Therefore, the greater sample of third-generation individuals and their family members was intended to allow for a closer examination of possible changes at play in the youngest generation.

All second-generation interviewees were born in the Netherlands. All third-generation participants had one first-generation parent who came to the Netherlands through marriage migration, and one second-generation parent who were born in the Netherlands ($n=7$) or came to the Netherlands before school age ($n=9$). Bilinguals from 11 different families were interviewed; six of these families consisted of siblings and mother, while five of them included only siblings. Although the intention had been to interview both parents in each family, no fathers wished to participate in the interviews. Interviewees ranged in age from 12 to 43. First-generation interviewees completed their education in Turkey (two were university graduates, one held high school diploma and two completed elementary school). Third-generation bilinguals were enrolled either in elementary school or high school in the Netherlands, while second-generation bilinguals varied in their educational levels from high school to higher education in the Netherlands.

2.2 Materials

The questionnaire used in this study was designed according to guidelines set by Schleef (2013). It consisted of four parts: “demographic information”, “language background and language use and preferences”, “language anxiety”, and “attitudes and experiences”. This article discusses only the results of the first and second part (see Appendix A for the English version), which comprised questions on bilinguals’ language acquisition history (i. e. when and where they started to learn languages), language dominance, ongoing language use and language preferences in six domains (family, school, work, friends, media use and leisure time, and cognitive activities), as well as bilinguals’ self-reports of proficiency in four skills in both languages. The first two parts of the questionnaire were adapted from two sources: the bilingualism and emotions questionnaire (Dewaele and Pavlenko 2001–2003) for the scales of language proficiency and dominance and language use in cognitive activities, and the language use and maintenance (GB) questionnaire (Jamai 2008) for the scales of language use and preferences.

Regarding language dominance, participants were asked which language(s) they consider their dominant language, which they are most fluent in and most comfortable speaking. They could choose one of three options: Turkish, Dutch, or both (i. e. Turkish and Dutch). Participants were asked to choose a value from

a 5-point scale for the amount of language use in six domains (1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Frequently, 5=All the time) and self-reported language proficiency (1=None, 2=Poor, 3=Fair, 4=Good, 5=Excellent). Table 3 contains score reliability information for the scales of language proficiency and language use in which Cronbach's Alpha coefficients vary from 0.69 (acceptable) to 0.96 (very satisfactory).

Table 3: Reliability of the language proficiency and language use scales.

The scale	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha	
		Dutch	Turkish
Language proficiency	4	0.96	0.95
Language use in domains			
Home/family domain	6	0.71	0.78
Outside	3	0.69	0.72
Media and leisure time	9	0.88	0.88
Cognitive activities	3	0.91	0.90

Semi-structured, open-ended interviews were also conducted (see Appendix B for the English translation). The interviews were designed to delve deeper into bilinguals' language history, linguistic dominance, and language practices and choices, while also providing a means to explore the story behind their experiences, learning languages motivations and attitudes towards bilingualism.

2.3 Procedure

The questionnaire was administered in the language of the participants' choice: Turkish or Dutch. Clear instructions on how to complete the questionnaire were given both in Turkish and in Dutch. At least one researcher was present at the time that participants completed the questionnaire, and was therefore available to help if they had any questions. Respondents finished the questionnaire independently in approximately 25 min, 89 percent of first-generation, 57 percent of second-generation and 10 percent of third-generation participants chose to fill in the questionnaire in Turkish.

Interviews were held one month after the questionnaire data had been collected. Each interview lasted between 40 min and one hour. Interviewees were given clear information about the content of the interview questions beforehand. They were informed that their language performance would not be evaluated or scored and they could mix their languages freely during the interviews if they had difficulties in explaining themselves without switching to Turkish or Dutch. There

were two interviewers, one of Turkish origin, the other Dutch. In order to prevent a possible interlocutor effect, the subjects were asked to choose their interviewer themselves by considering the criterion that they could share their personal experiences more comfortably and honestly. The rationale here was that giving interviewees freedom of selecting their interviewer might help create a stress-free atmosphere, and thus provide more reliable information. Twelve chose the Dutch researcher and 18 chose the Turkish researcher. The researchers had participants' previous responses to the questionnaire, and could therefore inquire into the remarks participants made earlier.

2.4 Analysis

For each item on the questionnaire, responses were coded as continuous (e. g. self-rated proficiency levels and frequency of language use) or categorical (e. g. generation, dominant language, place of language acquisition). Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the results in terms of frequencies and percentages for categorical variables as well as means and standard deviations for numerical variables. For the purpose of this study, focus was placed on cross-generational comparisons pertaining to the three main categories: language proficiency levels, language dominance, and daily language use. In order to reduce the large number of language background variables, generation effect were reported only on self-reported overall daily language use, and averaged scores of the four skills of language proficiency in Turkish and Dutch, rather than on each subcategory (e. g. language proficiency in four skills or language use in six different domains). The assumption of normality was checked, a series of one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests revealed non-normal distributions for self-rated overall language proficiency levels of Turkish and Dutch and self-reported overall daily language use (both significant at $p < 0.005$). Consequently, in order to capture the potential group effects (generation) on these variables, Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used as nonparametric equivalents to one-way ANOVA (see Field 2013). After Kruskal-Wallis tests, follow-up Mann-Whitney U tests were applied to examine unique pairs. In order to discover relationships between two categorical variables (generation, dominant language, gender and educational background), Pearson Chi-square test and Cramer's V statistics—an indicator of effect size—were used.

The interview data was transcribed and attention was given to participants' experiences of language maintenance and shift across generations. Procedures for "open coding", i. e. the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing and categorizing data (Strauss and Corbin 1990), were applied to provide structure and to give overviews of the interview texts. Instances of the

coded transcripts and themes were reviewed and compared for similarities and differences by two researchers, more focused coding was then undertaken. Following the *merging data approach* (Creswell and Plano Clark 2011), excerpts from the coded transcripts were selected to further investigate certain findings from the questionnaires, including additional details that could not be obtained through questionnaires alone.

In this study, the quantitative statistical results are followed by the qualitative quotes that support or refute the conclusions drawn from the quantitative data. Findings based on the questionnaires are presented in four main categories: (1) language history (i. e. AoA, and place of language acquisition), (2) language proficiency, (3) language dominance (language dominance and gender, language dominance and education), and (4) language use and choice (daily use of languages, and use of languages in six domains). Finally, findings based on interviews are discussed in three categories: (1) Prior exposure to languages, (2) use of languages and language dominance, and (3) attitudes and motivation.

3 Results

3.1 Findings based on questionnaires

3.1.1 Language history across generations

Table 4 presents the age and place of language acquisition for participants. Except for four third-generation bilinguals, all respondents had acquired Turkish from birth, reporting they were most often exposed to Turkish in a familial context at home. Without exception, all first-generation immigrants learned it in Turkey, whereas most second-generation and all third-generation bilinguals learned it at home in the Netherlands. Twenty-five second-generation bilinguals were exposed to Turkish before family reunification, and one attended Turkish language courses in the Netherlands.

Age and place of Dutch acquisition differ considerably across the three generations. All of the first-generation immigrants acquired Dutch after puberty, that is, as late bilinguals. Almost half of them attended a Dutch language course, while the rest acquired it through self-study or at work. The majority of second-generation bilinguals were exposed to it as school-aged children after they acquired Turkish. Twenty-two percent acquired Dutch as kindergarten children, while 16 percent began acquiring it from birth in their home environment. The majority of third-generation children reported being exposed to Dutch

Table 4: Language history of Turkish-Dutch bilinguals across generations.

	Dutch						Turkish			
	1st generation		2nd generation		3rd generation		1st generation		2nd generation	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Age of acquisition	22.0	7.2	3.6	2.9	1.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Place of acquisition										
Home in Turkey							100 %		25 %	
Home in the Netherlands			16 %		59 %				72 %	100 %
Kindergarten										
School			22 %		24 %					
Language course			62 %		17 %				3 %	
Work	49 %									
Self-study	11 %									
	40 %									

at home from birth. Of the rest, 24 percent were exposed to Dutch at pre-school age and 17 percent as school-aged children.

3.1.2 Language proficiency across generations

A Kruskal-Wallis test showed a highly significant generational effect for self-rated overall Dutch proficiency ($\chi^2=70.62$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$), and Turkish proficiency ($\chi^2=57.87$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$). Third-generation bilinguals reported higher proficiency in Dutch than first- and second-generation bilinguals. Conversely, third-generation bilinguals had lower self-rated proficiency in Turkish than first- and second-generation bilinguals. The means and standard deviations on bilinguals' self-reported overall proficiency in Dutch and Turkish are presented in Table 5, which indicate a gradual decline of language proficiency levels in Turkish and a contrasting increase in Dutch from generation to generation. This in turn points to a possible ongoing language shift.

Table 5: Self-reported language proficiency across generations.*

	Dutch						Turkish					
	1st generation		2nd generation		3rd generation		1st generation		2nd generation		3rd generation	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Language proficiency	3.3	0.8	4.6	0.4	4.9	0.4	4.7	0.4	4.2	0.5	3.1	0.9

Note: *Range of language proficiency: (1) none, (2) poor, (3) fair, (4) good, (5) excellent.

Figure 1: Self-reported Dutch and Turkish proficiency in four skills.

Figure 1 summarizes the self-reported proficiency in both languages for four skills across the three bilingual groups. First-generation participants reported the highest proficiency in Turkish and the lowest proficiency in Dutch in the four skills of understanding, reading, speaking and writing. Importantly, both second- and third-generation bilinguals rated their Turkish proficiency levels lower than Dutch. They reported the lowest Turkish proficiency in the skills of reading and writing, which can be caused by lack of systematic educational experiences in the HL.

3.1.3 Language dominance across generations

A Pearson Chi-square test showed a main effect of generation on bilinguals’ self-rated language dominance ($\chi^2(2) = 94.3$, $p < 0.001$), with third-generation bilinguals being significantly more dominant in Dutch than first- and second-generation bilinguals. For this chi-square test, Cramer’s V shows the effect size as 0.63 (with $df = 4$), which is categorized as a large effect (Cohen 1992). Table 6 summarizes bilinguals’ self-reports on the language(s) they considered to be their dominant language(s), which they were most fluent in, and which they spoke most comfortably.

Table 6: Language dominance in three generations of Turkish community in the Netherlands.

Dominant language	1st generation (%)	2nd generation (%)	3rdgeneration (%)
Both	13	43	7
Dutch	0	37	88
Turkish	87	20	5

These findings reveal a sharp contrast among generations in terms of language dominance. Turkish as a dominant language among first-generation immigrants yields to Dutch among third-generation bilinguals. In comparison to second-generation bilinguals, the number of bilinguals who reported being dominant in two languages also decreases by the third generation. Hence Dutch, the ML, seems to have become the dominant language of the youngest generation.

With regard to language dominance and gender, a Pearson Chi-square test found an effect of gender on dominant language ($\chi^2(2) = 6.82$, $p < 0.05$). The males to a large extent chose Dutch as their dominant language (Table 7). For this chi-square test, Cramer’s V shows the effect size as 0.24 (with $df = 2$), which is categorized as a medium effect size (Cohen 1992). Considering that the gender

Table 7: Participant's gender and dominant language.

Dominant language	Female (%)	Male (%)	Total (%)
Gender			
Both	18	20	20
Dutch	32	55	40
Turkish	50	25	40

bias is great in the participant sample, this interaction must therefore be treated with caution.

With regard to language dominance and educational background, a Pearson Chi-square test also found an effect of educational background on dominant language ($\chi^2(16) = 94.32$, $p < 0.001$). For this chi-square test, Cramer's V shows the effect size as 0.64 (with $df = 16$), which is categorized as a large effect size (Cohen 1992). Table 8 illustrates that the participants who went to school in the Netherlands mostly selected Dutch as their dominant language while the ones who went to school in Turkey mostly chose only Turkish as their dominant language.

Table 8: Participants' educational background and dominant language.*

Dominant language	Educational background								
	Elementary in TR (%)	High school in TR (%)	BA in TR (%)	High school (HAVO) in NL (%)	BA (HBO) in NL (%)	Student Elementary (%)	Student HAVO (%)	Student HBO (%)	Student MA (%)
Both	12	9	5	46	5	0	5	18	0
Dutch	0	0	0	17	6	24	40	9	4
Turkish	48	21	15	4	4	0	4	2	2

Note:* In the Netherlands, the HAVO (*hoger algemeen voortgezet onderwijs*) literally, "higher general continued education" has five grades and is attended from age twelve to seventeen. A HAVO diploma provides access to HBO, the level of (polytechnic) tertiary education.

3.1.4 Language use and choice

The questionnaire elicited information on bilinguals' daily use of languages, and use of languages in six selected settings (family, friends, school, work, media and leisure time, and cognitive activities).

With regard to overall daily language use across generations, Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a main effect of group in self-reported daily language use: Dutch ($\chi^2 = 39.34$, $df = 2$, $p < 0.001$), Turkish ($\chi^2 = 70.96$, $df = 2$, $p < 0.001$) and mixing Dutch and Turkish ($\chi^2 = 15.24$, $df = 2$, $p < 0.000$). Third-generation bilinguals reported that they used Dutch more frequently than first- and second-generation bilinguals. Third-generation bilinguals also reported using Turkish less frequently than first- and second-generation bilinguals. Both third- and second-generation bilinguals mixed Dutch and Turkish more frequently than first-generation immigrants. Note that follow-up Mann-Whitney U test showed no significant differences between first- and second-generation bilinguals on daily Turkish use ($U = 54$, $p > .05$), and between second- and third generation bilinguals on daily amount of mixing Dutch and Turkish ($U = 53$, $p > .05$).

Table 9 summarizes bilinguals' self-reports on their daily language use. Third-generation bilinguals' seem to use Dutch all the time. The majority of this generation reported using Turkish rarely or sometimes, while mixing Dutch and Turkish sometimes or frequently. Daily use of Dutch and mixing the languages was the least frequent among first-generation immigrants and use of Turkish the most frequent. As for second-generation bilinguals, although use of Dutch was the most frequent, Turkish and mixing languages also seemed to be a major part of their daily language use. These findings suggest a decline in the daily use of Turkish and an increase in Dutch use among the third-generation group, which can therefore be evidence for a possible language shift.

Results on language use will now be presented in six domains (i. e. home, school, work, friends, media and leisure time activities, and cognitive activities). With regard to language use in the home/family domain, Table 10 presents language use at home. Third-generation bilinguals seem to use a great deal of Dutch when speaking with their siblings, more Dutch than Turkish with their mothers, and more Turkish than Dutch with their fathers and grandparents. High standard deviations within the groups indicate that the amount of Turkish and Dutch used at home can vary depending on the composition, language background, and attitudes of each family. Nevertheless, it is evident that in comparison to first- and second-generation bilinguals, there is a marked increase in the amount of Dutch that third-generation children use at home.

Another striking difference between generations is the shift in language use with partners. Unlike first- and second-generation participants who speak Turkish very often with their spouse, third-generation bilinguals reported using much more Dutch than Turkish with their girlfriend/boyfriend. Note that 40 percent of second-generation immigrants married a Turkish-born spouse, while 17 percent married a Dutch-born person with Turkish ethnic background

Table 10: Self-reported language use in the home/family domain.*

	Dutch						Turkish						Mixing					
	1st generation			2nd generation			3rd generation			1st generation			2nd generation			3rd generation		
			M			M			M			M			M			M
	generation	SD		generation	SD		generation	SD		generation	SD		generation	SD		generation	SD	
1. Home/family		2.3	1.3															
With mother																		
With father																		
With siblings																		
With children																		
With partner																		
With grandparents																		

Note: * Range of language use: (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) frequently, (5) all the time.

and 43 percent were either single or divorced. On the other hand, 36 percent of third-generation bilinguals had Dutch-born partners (girlfriends/boyfriends) while the rest were single.

With regard to language use outside across the domains of friends, school and work, Table 11 summarizes information on bilinguals' self-reported language use across the domains of friends, school and work. The data suggest an increased use of Dutch among third-generation bilinguals. While first-generation immigrants speak Turkish frequently or all the time with their friends, Turkish seems to be replaced by Dutch in this setting for third-generation bilinguals. Second-generation participants reported a frequent use of Turkish and frequent mixing of Turkish and Dutch with friends, whereas third-generation bilinguals reported using Turkish never or rarely and mixing the languages rarely or sometimes.

Among the other settings, the school domain (for second- and third-generation children) and work domain (for all generations) displayed the highest amount of Dutch and lowest amount of Turkish use. Not surprisingly, second- and third-generation bilinguals used Dutch most often in the context of school and bilinguals of all three generations in the context of work.

With regard to language use across domains of media and leisure time, and cognitive activities, an overview of bilinguals' self-reported language use and preferences based in two other domains, media/leisure time, and cognitive activities, are presented in Table 12.

Cross-generational differences in language use while using media (especially TV and internet) and engaging in leisure time activities provide further evidence of the decline in Turkish use among third-generation bilinguals. The majority of these young bilinguals reported they almost never read books/novels, newspapers or magazines in Turkish, never listened to Turkish radio and only rarely used computer and social media in Turkish. On the other hand, the frequency of third-generation children reading books, newspapers, and magazines in Dutch and listening to Dutch radio as well as using computer and social media in Dutch are relatively higher than their self-rated frequency levels for Turkish. Meanwhile, listening to Turkish or Dutch music is less frequent among this group, as they mostly listen to songs in English.

To a great degree, Turkish TV, Turkish films and TV series occupy more leisure time of first-generation immigrants and, less frequently, second-generation bilinguals, than Dutch TV. On the other hand, third-generation children watch more Dutch TV than Turkish.

Finally, according to self-assessments of third-generation participants, Dutch is also their preferred language for emotional communication, mental calculation and inner speech, Turkish being used very rarely for these

	Dutch						Turkish						Mixing					
	1st generation			2nd generation			3rd generation			1st generation			2nd generation			3rd generation		
	M		SD	M		SD	M		SD	M		SD	M		SD	M		SD
2. Friends	2.7	1.3	4.2	0.7	4.7	0.6	4.3	0.9	4.0	8.8	2.4	1.1	2.4	1.1	3.6	1.0	2.8	1.4
3. School			4.8	0.5	4.9	0.2			2.1	1.2	1.4	0.8			2.2	1.3	1.7	1.1
4. Work	4.5	1.0	4.8	0.5	4.8	0.4	2.3	1.7	2.4	1.4	2.3	1.4	2.1	1.4	2.0	1.1	2.6	1.4

Brought to you by | University of Oslo Norway
Authenticated
Download Date | 9/8/17 1:01 PM

Table 12: Self-reported language use and preferences across the domains of media and cognitive activities.*

	Dutch						Turkish					
	1st generation		2nd generation		3rd generation		1st generation		2nd generation		3rd generation	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
5. Media/leisure time												
Books/novels	1.8	1.0	3.0	1.5	4.5	1.0	3.5	1.6	2.6	1.3	1.4	0.8
Newspapers	2.2	1.2	3.6	1.4	3.8	1.5	3.2	1.5	2.8	1.4	1.2	0.6
Magazines	2.0	1.2	3.0	1.6	4.0	1.3	2.9	1.6	2.3	1.4	1.1	0.5
Radio	2.2	1.4	3.2	1.6	4.0	1.3	3.1	1.8	2.4	1.5	1.9	1.3
Television	2.4	1.3	3.3	1.4	4.0	1.2	4.5	0.8	4.1	1.0	3.0	1.5
Films/TV series	2.2	1.3	3.0	1.5	3.8	1.4	4.4	0.9	3.9	1.3	3.0	1.6
Music	1.9	1.3	2.5	1.5	2.9	1.7	4.2	1.2	4.0	1.2	2.8	1.5
Computer	2.8	1.7	4.6	0.8	4.5	1.0	3.4	1.7	2.7	1.6	1.8	1.1
Social media	2.4	1.3	4.0	1.1	4.6	0.6	3.6	1.5	3.5	1.5	2.2	1.2
6. Cognitive activities												
Emotions	2.2	1.3	3.6	1.1	4.5	0.7	4.6	0.7	4.2	0.8	2.4	1.2
Arithmetic	1.9	1.3	4.2	0.8	4.9	0.3	4.7	0.6	3.5	1.1	1.3	0.7
Inner speech	1.9	1.1	3.2	1.1	4.4	0.9	4.6	0.8	4.2	0.8	2.5	1.3

Note: * Range of language use: (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) frequently, (5) all the time.

cognitive activities. First-generation immigrants showed the opposite picture. Second-generation bilinguals reported using more Turkish than Dutch for emotional expressions, as well as for inner speech, yet more Dutch than Turkish for calculations.

Findings based on bilinguals' language use and preferences suggest that Dutch has become the dominant language of many young bilinguals in many or all domains. The predominant use of Turkish in each domain remains strong among first-generation immigrants, while it varies among second-generation and diminishes for third-generation bilinguals.

3.2 Findings based on interviews

The questionnaire data show that three generations of Turkish immigrants differ in their language history, self-reported proficiency and use patterns. Overall, the interviews support the questionnaire findings on the gradual decline of Turkish use from generation to generation. Yet they also provide us with more detailed information about the causes of language shift, and the variation of immigrant experiences, that exists not only among different generations but also within a generation and even within a family.

The key findings from the interviews are presented below in three categories: (1) prior exposure to languages, (2) current exposure to languages and language dominance and (3) motivation for and attitudes toward learning languages. Special emphasis is placed on experiences that influence the factors that bilinguals themselves see as contributing to language maintenance or shift.

3.2.1 Prior exposure to languages

Interviewees raised a number of key issues that help explain the composition of their repertoires. First of all, for many first-generation immigrants in this community, particularly for women, age of arrival in the Netherlands does not necessarily mean age of exposure to the Dutch language. Three of the six first-generation women interviewed (AA, SDD, DG) were divorced, and they claimed that Dutch acquisition for them had begun post-divorce. DG (33 years old) describes her experiences as follows:

Excerpt (1)

Interviewer: When and how did you arrive in the Netherlands?

DG: Eighteen years ago, when I was 15. It was never my own decision. I was forced to marry and brought here... Later on, the kids were

born, I took care of them, only my ex-husband's family came for a visit, we talked Turkish all the time.

Interviewer: When did you learn Dutch then?

DG: Six years after [arrival]. Right after I divorced my husband. Before the divorce, I didn't speak even one word in Dutch. Then, I went to a course, I practised it with my children at home, Dutch neighbors...

One of the first-generation participants (AT, 42 years old) explained how she was subject to her husband's authority which included restrictions on her Dutch language practices. AT had been in the Netherlands for 26 years and had almost no command of Dutch. When asked why, she explained:

Excerpt (2)

AT: My husband didn't let me learn it; I couldn't go to language courses... He's scared that I'll divorce him if I speak Dutch. He doesn't want me to learn Dutch, because he just wants me to be in need of him...

AT's situation illustrates that even after many years in the Netherlands, Turkish immigrants may have limited Dutch knowledge due to family-related restrictions. It also suggests that knowing Dutch carries some power that is evident not only in political, social and economic contexts, but also in the contexts of immigrant families. A good command of Dutch is equated with power, equality and freedom for some women while it denotes domination to some men.

As for second-generation bilinguals, all of them grew up in minority neighborhoods where their parents often socialized with other Turkish families. They were not exposed to Dutch until they started school. SAK (27 years old) describes her first day of school:

Excerpt (3)

SAK: I'll never forget the first day of school. I couldn't even speak one word of Dutch. The teacher was talking and I didn't understand one word. I was scared to death of speaking Dutch. I couldn't make friends for a long time, I felt like an idiot. At home, there was nobody who could help me with my homework. For instance, my youngest sister never experienced these difficulties as I did. I always helped her and spoke

Dutch to her. Thus, her Dutch is better, but she is ashamed of her Turkish...

SAK's statement also points out the variation within one family; where younger siblings may be exposed earlier to Dutch and with more intensity.

Unlike second-generation bilinguals, many third-generation children indicated that they acquired Turkish and Dutch from birth. In addition, they sometimes mentioned "the neighborhood effect", or as DG described it, "practicing Dutch with Dutch neighbours". Many participants emphasized the effects of their neighbourhood on their language knowledge. Two third-generation bilinguals, PK (18 years old) and EK (14 years old) indicated that they were exposed to Turkish only after moving to a neighborhood with predominantly minority families, and they started to play with other Turkish immigrant children. Here is PK's description:

Excerpt (4)

Interviewer: When and how did you learn the languages?

PK: First actually Dutch and later Turkish. But that was really years later.

Interviewer: So at home Dutch was spoken?

PK: Yes, mostly Dutch...We also lived in a neighborhood where only Dutch people lived so it was impossible to learn Turkish... Later, we moved to a place where there were more Turkish people...

Interviewer: How old were you when you started to speak Turkish?

PK: 14, 15...

3.2.2 Use of languages and language dominance

When asked what the prevalent language was in their current home, first-generation immigrants answered "Turkish occasionally mixed with some Dutch words". Second-generation bilinguals reported "a mix of Turkish and Dutch," while third-generation bilinguals said "Dutch" or "mixing languages" with parents and "mostly Dutch" with siblings. Third-generation children whose dominant language is Dutch may still be exposed to a considerable amount of Turkish through contact with parents or other older family members, yet they feel more comfortable responding in Dutch even when addressed in Turkish. This is how DG, a first-generation immigrant married to a second-generation man, described her third-generation daughter's Turkish:

Excerpt (5)

DG: Her Turkish is terrible. Just now too, I was talking Turkish outside, she didn't understand me, she was staring blankly. Even if she understands, she doesn't respond in Turkish. Because she finds Dutch easy, and automatically she starts speaking Dutch. In fact, she knows [Turkish] but when she doesn't practice... I don't feel that she knows it in practice... I tell her "read Turkish books, watch Turkish channels", she doesn't do any of that.

DG's daughter, 13-year-old IK elaborated on her interaction with her mother (DG) regarding language use, also noting the tension it created:

Excerpt (6)

IK: My mother gets angry when I don't understand her. She says "your Turkish is too bad, read Turkish books, watch Turkish channels". Then we quarrel. Then I don't speak Turkish with her. She asks in Turkish, I reply in Dutch.

Interviewer: When do you speak Turkish then?

IK: With my friend after school.

Interviewer: How do you speak? Only Turkish?

IK: No. We can't speak only Turkish. Because we don't know many things {words} in Turkish. We make mixed {mixing Turkish and Dutch words}.

On the other hand a 14-year-old, third-generation ET illustrated the tension between her and her grandfather as follows:

Excerpt (7)

ET: My grandfather makes me stressed about my Turkish. He says that I can't talk Turkish very well. I should fix it, he says, otherwise I won't be able to find a husband. He even says even if I find one [husband], I won't be able to communicate with my mother-in-law.

Another conflict regarding language use at home arises when spouses who move from Turkey use their new home environment to practise their Dutch with their children. This trend of learning Dutch from/with children seems to reduce the amount of Turkish exposure at home whilst also causing tensions in the family about Dutch proficiency. According to 13-year-old third-generation SE, his mother, a second-generation bilingual, insisted her children not speak Dutch with their father (a first-generation immigrant) because speaking Dutch with him

negatively influenced the children's Dutch proficiency. This is how he explained the situation:

Excerpt (8)

Interviewer: Are there any rules at home you have to obey regarding speaking a language?

SE: Yes, actually I have to speak Turkish to my dad. Because my mother says I also started to speak poor Dutch because of him, because I copied my dad's language when he spoke Dutch, wrong use of language and incorrect syntax.

The other third-generation interviewees said that there were no rules about language use at home nor were there extra activities to improve their Turkish. For instance, they neither read Turkish books nor had someone read books to them when they were little. According to mothers interviewed, the only Turkish practice tool at home was Turkish satellite TV but their children preferred Dutch TV. These language choices reflect young bilinguals' increasing dominance in Dutch.

3.2.3 Attitudes and motivation

In the interviews, children and mothers alike voiced very positive attitudes about multilingualism and speaking correct Dutch and Turkish. As they saw it, knowing Dutch leads to economic security, the ability to communicate and interact with a wide range of people, and access to knowledge sources outside of their immediate community. Turkish, on the other hand, helps connect them with Turkish culture and their relatives, particularly those back in Turkey.

First-generation immigrants were aware of the immediate advantages of having children who could translate for older family members helping especially to communicate with Dutch authorities. All six first-generation bilinguals expressed the importance of maintaining Turkish by saying "because it is my mother tongue". Three of the first-generation immigrants emphasized their strong emotional attachment to Turkey, Turkish culture, and indeed religion, Islam. AT (42 years old), a first-generation mother with almost no command of Dutch, made this aspect clear:

Excerpt (9)

AT: For me, Turkish is more important because we are Muslims, it is also my own mother tongue... Dutch is important as well, as you need to make

yourself understood here [in the Netherlands]. For instance, I can't even go to the doctor without my daughters, they act as an interpreter for me... And also, Dutch is important for the next generation to reach a higher status in the Netherlands. They must know Dutch very well without losing our own language (Turkish) and culture.

As mentioned by AT, first and second generation bilinguals expressed their expectations for their children and grandchildren to maintain the Turkish language and culture, at the same time, to master the Dutch language completely.

Like first- and second-generation bilinguals, the majority of third-generation children thought that Turkish was important because it was linked to Turkish identity and culture. In the words of SE:

Excerpt (10)

SE: Turkish is important, and I have to speak it perfectly because it's in my blood... [It's] more like being proud of your country... loving your own country, you know. Because every person loves his/her own country.

For SE's older brother, 15-year-old IE, Turkish is less important, but he had to learn it for the sake of his culture:

Excerpt (11)

IE: Dutch is more important because I live in the Netherlands. I think Turkish is kind of less important to me. But it still belongs to my culture. So I have to know Turkish.

Only a few second- and third-generation bilinguals identified themselves as neither Turkish nor Dutch. They indicated that sometimes they felt caught between two cultures. Nevertheless, they all emphasized that both languages were important. This is how 26-year-old, second-generation SLD explained it:

Excerpt (12)

Interviewer: You said your Turkish is not so perfect. Do you think you need to speak Turkish "perfectly"?

SLD: Sure.

Interviewer: Why is that?

SLD: ... Even though I was born in the Netherlands, my parents are Turkish. Actually, I don't feel like either a Turkish or a Dutch person. It's so bad that we're mixed up in between two countries...

However, the languages are important. Dutch is a must, in order not to let Dutch people overpower you, in order to prove yourself to Dutch people. Turkish is also important, in order not to be fooled by Turkish shopkeepers when we do shopping in Turkey. They say a higher price when they find out we live in Europe.⁴

All participants were well aware of and concerned about the decrease in their use and knowledge of Turkish. Regarding opinions about language choice, all the third-generation bilinguals indicated they preferred speaking Dutch because they thought their Turkish was not very good. KB, a 15-year-old third-generation bilingual, makes this clear:

Excerpt (13)

KB: I also try to speak Turkish sometimes, but it isn't that great... So I prefer to speak Dutch. Or just Dutch sentences and then something in Turkish or so.

The majority of the second- and all third-generation bilinguals indicated that the Turkish they spoke was entirely different from the Turkish spoken in Turkey. Some thought that their Turkish was bad due to the influence of Dutch, some thought it was due to excessive exposure to Dutch or due to the frequent intermingling of Turkish and Dutch. SVD, a 26-year-old second-generation immigrant, assessed the Turkish spoken in the Netherlands and in Turkey and elaborated on the consequences of Turkish-Dutch language contact (i. e. influence of Dutch, code-switching):

Excerpt (14)

SVD: For instance, I can't speak comfortably in Turkey, I don't know, I mean people there sound too kind and modern to me... We, the Turks in the Netherlands, talk pell-mell [messily]. I don't know if it is because of the "gh" sound of Dutch; I mean we speak rudely... And also, we're not used to speaking only Turkish; one of every two words we speak is Dutch, this certainly has an effect [on it] too.

Despite the value they ascribed to Turkish language and culture, the majority (22) of second- and third-generation bilinguals stated that Dutch occupied a significant place in their lives. They emphasized that Dutch was more important

⁴ This excerpt, as many others, suggests a possible internalized discrimination that the Turkish immigrants living in Europe face in Turkey. This will be further elaborated in a future study.

than Turkish since they were born and lived in the Netherlands. All third-generation bilinguals were aware that succeeding in school and a career required speaking “perfect Dutch”.

Twenty five of the participants in all generations stressed that they experienced pressure from the Dutch community to speak Dutch (e. g. at school, at work). Furthermore, they were all concerned that speaking Turkish was not tolerated particularly at schools. ST (11 years old) elaborated on the consequences of speaking Turkish at school:

Excerpt (15)

ST: You can't speak Turkish at school, there are punishments, you are writing.

Interviewer: What are you writing?

ST: You write in Dutch... Writing homework punishment.

Six second-generation bilinguals shared their concerns and experiences of discrimination. All of them agreed that they had to speak Dutch as well as, or better than a Dutch person to avoid being discriminated against or alienated at school or at work. For many, the Dutch language was a key factor in proving themselves to Dutch people and leading a satisfying life without being despised due to their different cultural background. SLD's recounting of discrimination she experienced due to language limitation summarizes the prejudice faced by second-generation children at school:

Excerpt (16)

SLD: ... I experienced that when someone goes to school, if she doesn't speak Dutch very well, they point their fingers at her, [it's] more like they expel her from everything. For instance, they mostly talk to the ones who speak Dutch better. My teacher, for instance, didn't like the students who come from outside [of the Netherlands]... He always put us down saying, “they are Turks, Moroccans, how do they know it...” So, I don't want my child experiencing these things as well. That's why for me Dutch is more important.

Based on their experiences, second-generation bilinguals challenge the trend that “the kids will learn Dutch at school anyway”. This situation may influence the amount of Dutch and Turkish used at home and also the age of acquisition of these languages.

4 Discussion and concluding remarks

Given that the current findings are based on self-reports and there is gender bias in the current sample, the interpretations regarding language shift and gender differences presented here should be treated with caution. Despite these limitations, this study sheds crucial light on a possible language shift occurring among third-generation Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands.

Questionnaire and interview data demonstrate that a shift from Turkish to Dutch might be occurring from generation to generation. This was evident in self-rated language proficiency, language dominance and for language choice in six domains: home, school, work, friends, media and leisure time activities, and cognitive activities. Compared to first-generation immigrants, the use of Turkish varies more among second-generation, but declines considerably among third-generation bilinguals.

Overall, language history and current language practices of third-generation bilinguals certainly differ from first- and second-generation bilinguals. As suggested in Sevinç (2014), Dutch has gained more ground among these young bilinguals, and having only one second-generation parent at home has increased their exposure to Dutch. Following the pattern of language shift described by Saltarelli and Gonzo (1977), the amount and dominance of Dutch in third-generation bilinguals' daily lives have increased, and acquisition of Dutch has begun occurring before school age or from birth. Globalization, which supposedly promotes language maintenance, does not seem to stop language shift. The predominant use of Dutch-language media and internet among third-generation bilinguals' indicates a perceived tension and need to shift to the ML may prevail against language maintenance efforts.

The findings from the interview data show that AoAr may not be a definite factor in determining Dutch proficiency levels of first-generation Turkish immigrants, particularly for women. As in recent studies on gender and multilingualism (Piller and Pavlenko 2009; Sharma 2011), the data show that power relations of gendered identities and linguistic practices may play a big role in Turkish-Dutch bilinguals' language dominance. In obedience to their husband's authority, some Turkish women are isolated at home and have little opportunity to practise Dutch. In the Turkish immigrant context, AoA accompanied by school attendance in the Netherlands may provide better estimates of Dutch exposure and proficiency. Likewise, language use and practices along with social factors (i. e. neighbourhood engagements, family members' proficiency) seem to have a strong influence on Turkish-Dutch bilinguals' language knowledge.

Language choices of Turkish-Dutch bilinguals vary particularly in the domains of home and media/leisure time activities. In addition to the differences in language preferences across generations, wide variation also exists within the same generation, even within the same family, as in the case where younger siblings are exposed to Dutch more often and earlier than older ones. Nevertheless, potential variation within the family was not tested systematically with the current methodology and data. Further studies should examine the intra-family variation more closely. Another important phenomenon in this community is that particularly among second- and third-generation bilinguals, using Dutch words while speaking Turkish (i. e. code-switching) has become a common language style. According to some bilinguals, this frequent mixing of Turkish and Dutch arises from their limited Turkish vocabulary and, along with other factors (i. e. excessive exposure to Dutch, influence of Dutch), negatively influences their Turkish proficiency. Therefore, the Turkish immigrant community in the Netherlands may no longer be as linguistically homogeneous as once observed. The dissolution of homogeneity can be a sign of social change in which maintaining the Turkish language has become a challenge, whereas speaking Dutch is a necessity in the Netherlands.

The interviews with Turkish-Dutch bilinguals regarding their attitudes towards languages, motivations for learning languages, opinions about language choice, and their experiences also pointed to a sign of ongoing language shift. Bilinguals in all three generations emphasize their concerns about the decrease in Turkish use and knowledge of third-generation bilinguals. They stress that the Turkish they speak in the Netherlands differs from the Turkish spoken in Turkey. All of them exhibit very positive attitudes towards both Turkish and Dutch but with a range of different motives. For first-generation bilinguals, Turkish is of greater value than Dutch for reasons of identity, culture and religion. Although the majority of second- and third-generation bilinguals also display positive attitudes that reveal a deep commitment to Turkish culture and identity, they also express an emotional attachment to the Netherlands as their birth country. They acknowledge the increasing importance of knowing Dutch as opposed to Turkish, and the power this yields. Most feel that their economic security and future prospects are largely dependent on their eventual attainment level in Dutch. Additionally, the interview data unveil the perceived sociolinguistic need to shift to Dutch, as well as parents' expectations for their children's academic achievements, which may cause immigrant children to experience tensions and ambiguities in the process of language maintenance and shift (Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Canagarajah 2008).

Furthermore, the research findings show that the relationship between Turkish identity and language maintenance may not be unidirectional. As Edwards (1984) argues, a continuity of identity may not necessarily be dependent upon communicative language retention. Despite Turkish immigrants' commitment to retaining Turkish language and identity, the decline observed in third-generation bilinguals' proficiency and use of Turkish confirms that language maintenance fades among third-generation bilinguals. Although they value Turkish, the findings on the language use and practices indicate that many third-generation bilinguals make no specific efforts in practice to maintain it. Many prefer Dutch when responding to their parents since they feel more comfortable speaking Dutch than Turkish. This situation seems to cause socioemotional pressure concerning Turkish language maintenance, triggering intergenerational tension within the family.

The nexus of Turkish language and identity among the young generation, however, cannot be precisely described from the current study alone. Further research is necessary to investigate the intricate connections between identity and language shift. In addition, many other compelling factors related to Turkish immigrants' experiences both in their home and their host countries remain unexplored. For instance, the socioemotional consequences of self-perceived language shift of these community members for which ethnic identity is a core value (Extra and Yağmur 2004) would be worth considering for further exploration. Linguistic anxiety of immigrants, as one of the possible effects of the pressure and tension that immigrants experience within and outside the family would also be a valuable subject for future research. Note, again, that all the results of this study must be interpreted with caution, since they are based on a limited number of participants particularly in the younger generation ($n=41$). For a thorough examination of linguistic and social components of language shift, further studies are needed that include more participants from different social backgrounds and combine different methods (e. g. linguistic analysis, self-reports or interviews).

Acknowledgements: The author thanks Ad Backus, Marianne Gullberg, Anne Golden, her colleagues at MultiLing, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions on earlier version of this article.

Funding: This study was financially supported by the Research Council of Norway through its Centres of Excellence funding scheme, project number 223265.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Appendix B

Interview Questions

References

- Alders, Maarten, & Ingeborg Keij. 2001. Statistics Netherlands. Retrieved 4 27, 2014, from third generation Turkish and Moroccan immigrants still small: <http://www.cbs.nl/en-GB/menu/themas/bevolking/publicaties/artikelen/archief/2001/2001-0813-wm.htm>.
- Backus, Ad. 2013. Turkish as an immigrant language in Europe. In Tej K. Bhatia & William C. Ritchie (eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*, 2nd edn., 770–790. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Baker, Colin. 2000. *A parents' and teachers' guide to bilingualism*, 2nd edn. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Blom, Elma. 2010. Effects of input on the early grammatical development of bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 14. 422–446.
- Bybee, Joan. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Canagarajah, Suresh A. 2008. Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(2). 143–176.
- Creswell, John W. & Vicki L. Plano Clark. 2011. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*, 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cohen, Jacob. 1992. [A power primer](#). *Psychological Bulletin* 112(1). 155–159.
- Dewaele, Jean-Marc. 2004. Perceived language dominance and language preference for emotional speech: The implications for attrition research. In Monika S. Schmid, Barbara Köpke, Merel Keijser & Lina Weilemar (eds.), *First language attrition: Interdisciplinary perspectives on methodological issues*, 81–104. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Dewaele, Jean-Marc & Aneta Pavlenko. 2001–2003. *Web questionnaire on bilingualism and emotion*. Unpublished manuscript, University of London.
- DeKeyser, Robert, Iris Alfi-Shabtay & Dorit Ravid. 2010. Cross-linguistic evidence for the nature of age effects in second language acquisition. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 31. 413–438.
- De Klerk, Vivian. 2000. Language shift in Grahamstown: As case study of selected Xhosa-speakers. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 146. 87–110.
- Doğruöz, A. Seza & Ad Backus. 2009. Innovative constructions in Dutch Turkish: An assessment of on-going contact-induced change, Bilingualism: *Language and Cognition* 12(1). 41–63.
- Doğruöz, A. Seza & Stefan Th. Gries. 2012. Spread of on-going changes in an immigrant language. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 10(2). 401–426.

- Driessen, Geert, Frans Van der Slik & Kees de Bot. 2002. Home language and language proficiency: A Large-scale Longitudinal Study in Dutch Primary Schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 23(3). 175–194.
- Ellis, Rod. 1994. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, John. 1984. Language, diversity and identity. In John Edwards (ed.), *Linguistic minorities, policies and pluralism*, 277–310. London: Academic Press.
- Extra, Guus & Kutlay Yağmur. 2004. *Urban multilingualism in Europe: Immigrant minority languages at home and school*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Extra, Guus & Kutlay Yağmur. 2010. Language proficiency and socio-cultural orientation of Turkish and Moroccan youngsters in the Netherlands. *Language and Education* 24(2). 117–132.
- Field, Andy. 2013. *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 2nd edn. London: Sage
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. *The sociology of language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language shift: Social determinants of language change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goulbourne, Harry, Tracey Reynolds, John Solomos, & Elisabetta Zontini. 2010. *Transnational families. Ethnicities, identities and social capital*. London: Routledge.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. & Lindsay J. Whaley. 2006. *Saving languages. An introduction to language revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grosjean, Francois. 1994. Individual Bilingualism. In Robert E. Asher & Jimmy M. Y. Simpson (eds.), *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, volume 3, 1656–1660. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Hlavac, Jim. 2013. Multilinguals and their sociolinguistic profiles: observations on language use amongst three vintages of migrants in Melbourne. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 10(4). 411–440.
- Hulsen, Madeleine, Kees de Bot & Bert Weltens. 2002. “Between two worlds.” Social networks, language shift, and language processing in three generations of Dutch migrants in New Zealand. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 153. 27–52.
- Jamai, Abdeslam. 2008. *Language use and maintenance among the Moroccan minority in Britain*. PhD thesis. University of Salford. Salford: UK.
- Kang, Hyun-Sook & In-Sop Kim. 2012. Perceived and actual competence and ethnic identity in heritage language learning: A case of Korean-American college students. *International Journal of Education and Bilingualism* 15(3). 279–294.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lanza, Elizabeth & Bente A. Svendsen. 2007. Tell me who your friends are and I might be able to tell you what language(s) you speak: Social network analysis, multilingualism, and identity. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 11(3). 275–300.
- Leseman, Paul P. M. 2000. Bilingual vocabulary development of Turkish preschoolers in the Netherlands. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 21(2). 93–112.
- Li, Wei. 1994. *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- MacLeod, Andrea A. N. & Carol Stoel-Gammon. 2010. What is the impact of age of second language acquisition on the production of consonants and vowels among childhood bilinguals? *International Journal of Bilingualism* 14(4). 400–421.

- Milewski, Nadja & Christelle Hamel. 2010. Union formation and partner choice in a transnational context: The case of descendants of Turkish immigrants in France. *International Migration Review* 44(3). 615–658.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1980. *Language and social networks*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Montrul, Silvina. 2013. Bilingualism and the heritage language speaker. In Tej K. Bhatia & William C. Ritchie (eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*, 2nd edn., 168–189. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Oh, Janet S. & Fuligni Andrew J. 2010. The role of heritage language development in the ethnic identity and family relationships of adolescents from immigrant backgrounds. *Social Development* 19(1). 202–220.
- Pavlenko, Aneta. 2014. *The bilingual mind: And what it tells us about language and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Piller, Ingrid & Aneta Pavlenko. 2009. Globalization, multilingualism, and gender: Looking into the future. In Li Wei & Vivian Cook (eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics 2: Linguistics for the real world*, 10–27. London: Continuum.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1995. *Bilingualism*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Portes, Alejandro & Ruben G. Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press and Russell Sage Foundation.
- Portes, Alejandro & Lingxin Hao. 2002. The price of uniformity: Language, family and personality adjustment in the immigrant second generation. *Ethnic and racial studies* 25. 889–912.
- Saltarelli, Mario & Susan Gonzo. 1977. Migrant languages: Linguistic change in progress. In Marcel De Grève & Eddy Rosseel (eds.), *Problèmes Linguistiques des Enfants des Travailleurs Migrants*, 167–186. Bruxelles: Didier.
- Schleef, Erik. 2013. Written surveys and questionnaires. In Janet Holmes & Kirk Hazen (eds.), *Research Methods in Sociolinguistics*, 42–57. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Sevinç, Yeşim. 2014. Linguistic and social factors in Turkish-Dutch contact across generations. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(1). 82–100.
- Sharma, Devyani. 2011. Style repertoire and social change in British Asian English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15(4). 464–492.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stevens, Gillian. 1999. Age at immigration and second language proficiency among foreign-born adults. *Language in society* 28. 555–578.
- Stoessel, Saskia. 2002. Investigating the role of social networks in language maintenance and shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 153. 93–131.
- Strauss, Anselm & Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2008. Social and linguistic factors as predictors of contact-induced change. *Journal of Language Contact* 2(1). 42–56.
- Valdés, Guadalupe, Joshua A. Fishman, Rebecca Chávez & William Pérez. 2006. *Developing minority language resources. The case of Spanish in California*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Vedder, Paul & Virta, Erkki. 2005. Language, ethnic identity and the adaptation of Turkish immigrant youth in the Netherlands and Sweden. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29(3). 317–337.

- Yağmur, Kutlay. 2009. Language use and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish compared with the Dutch in the Netherlands. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 30(3). 219–233.
- Yılmaz, Gülsen & Monika S. Schmid. 2015. Second language development in a migrant context: Turkish community in the Netherlands. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 236. 101–132.

Supplemental Material: The online version of this article (DOI: 10.1515/ijsl-2016-0034) offers supplementary material, available to authorized users.