

# LINGUISTIC AND SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF TURKISH/GERMAN BILINGUAL ISN OF NI GRANT CHILDREN IN BERLIN

**Carol W. Pfaff**

## **0. Introduction**

The workshop on children's language in diaspora, held in Lund, July 1987, provided the opportunity to examine and compare the social and linguistic effects of immigration across a range of European languages in contact. This paper, which grew out of a presentation at that workshop, surveys some sociolinguistic and educational issues related to bilingual language acquisition and use by Turkish children in West Berlin.

The first section presents an overview of the demographic situation of Turkish and other foreign children and summarizes the school policies and practices which provide the framework of bilingual language acquisition. The rest of the paper presents some of the results of an experimental psycho- and sociolinguistic investigation of 5 to 12-year-old bilingual children. The focus of the pre sent paper is the use and linguistic development of Turkish, including the following aspects:

- language use at home, in school and after school
- characteristics of the Turkish lexicon, including nonstandard forms, loan words and code-switching
- the realization of several Turkish morphological categories related to nominal reference, including the expression of case, number and modification in noun phrases.

## **1. Demographic Overview and Educational Policies**

Population statistics for 1986 given in Table 1 show that nearly one eighth of the population of West Berlin is foreign, the majori-

**TABLE 1: TURKISH CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS IN BERLIN (WEST)**

Population of Berlin (West) 30. June 1986

Carol W. Pfaff

	Total population (German + Foreign)	Total Foreign	Turkish	Yugoslavian	Polish	Italian	Greek	Spanish Portuguese Moroccan Tunisian	Other <sup>a</sup>
all ages	2,153,321	254,412	114,030 (44.8%)	30,737 (12.1%)	11,776 (4.6%)	7,730 (3.0%)	7,194 (2.8%)	3,712 (1.5%)	79,233 (31.2%)
children and adolescents	0-5 years 88,604 5-10 years 84,131 10-15 years 85,549 15-20 years 124,474	18,307 19,254 20,047 20,122	11,187 11,502 12,608 12,592	1,753 2,462 2,951 2,003	542 536 364 259	325 258 274 422	294 369 507 530	223 220 171 167	3,983 3,907 3,172 4,149
selected districts	Kreuzberg 149,651 Wedding 155,868	39,659 30,687	26,249 18,949	3,239 3,809	1,002 1,049	796 723	1,131 625	362 289	6,880 5,243

"Other" includes (in descending order of population)

American,	British,	Austrian,	"staatenlos",	Iranian,	French,	Lebanese
7,058	6,293	5,906	5,900	5,761	5,278	4,140

SOURCE: Berliner Statistik. Statistisches Landesamt Berlin Nov. 1986, May 1987.

ty of which (approximately 45/.) is Turkish. It should be noted that this Turkish population is neither socially nor linguistically homogeneous. In addition to the former peasant and working class migrants motivated primarily by economic concerns, many of whom originally intended to return to Turkey with a better socioeconomic standing, there are also numerous politically motivated migrants, including highly educated intellectuals who, at least for the present, have no intention of returning. The differential in education is one of the factors among many which must be taken into account in categorizing children for comparative studies of language development. Even more directly relevant for linguistic investigations is the fact that the population classified as Turkish on the basis of their nationality includes a large proportion of Kurds (some estimates are as high as 30%), many of whom, especially the women, speak only Kurdish, an Indo-European language unrelated to Turkish.

As shown in Table 2, which gives the percentage of foreign children in the schools by district, the highest concentrations of foreign pupils are in the districts Kreuzberg, Wedding, Schöneberg and Tiergarten.

**TABLE 2: PERCENT OF FOREIGN PUPILS BY DISTRICT**

<b>Charlottenburg:</b>	<b>20.2%</b>	<b>Tempelhof:</b>	<b>9.5%</b>
<b>Kreuzberg:</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>Tiergarten:</b>	<b>30.4%</b>
<b>Neukölln:</b>	<b>22.5%</b>	<b>Wedding:</b>	<b>39.3%</b>
<b>Reinickendorf:</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>Wilmerdorf:</b>	<b>13.1%</b>
<b>Schöneberg:</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>Zehlendorf:</b>	<b>10.0%</b>
<b>Spandau:</b>	<b>13.9%</b>		
<b>Steglitz:</b>	<b>8.0%</b>		

**Source: Senator für Schulwesen: "Das Schuljahr 1985/86 in Zahlen" cited in Steimmüller 1986:2.**

Because of the high proportion of immigrants from Turkey, the attempts to provide appropriate educational programs within the German school system have largely focused on various forms of bilingual education in Turkish, while other minorities rely primarily

on community-based language and cultural programs outside regular school hours. The focus on bilingual education for Turkish pupils is warranted not only by their numbers but also by the fact that the level of educational attainment of this group is considerably lower than that of other minorities. As shown in Table 3, Turkish children are overrepresented in the Hauptschule, the secondary school oriented toward preparation of pupils for unskilled and semi-skilled trades, while underrepresented in the college-preparatory Gymnasium.

**TABLE 3: PERCENT OF ALL FOREIGN AND TURKISH PUPILS BY SCHOOL TYPE**

SCHULART	% ausl. Schüler	% türkische Schüler
Grundschule	24.3%	15.6%
Hauptschule	38.4%	30.5%
Realschule	13.9%	8.0%
Gymnasium	7.2%	3.1%
Gesamtschule	19.6%	12.0%
Lern- und geistig		
Behinderte	30.6%	21.3%
Übrige Sonderschulen	13.8%	7.4%

Source: Senator für Schulwesen: "Das Schuljahr 1985/86 in Zahlen"  
cited in Steirmüller 1986:2-3

Further, statistics for the 1985/86 school year reveal that close to half of all foreign children leave school without any diploma; the majority of these are Turkish.

Although there are other contributing factors, poor German language skills play a major role here. School policy contributes indirectly by limiting contact with native speakers of German for a sizeable part of the Turkish population. Although the official policy is to foster integration of foreign pupils and native German children, regulations on classroom population demand that at least half be native Germans. In order to conform to these regulations,

TABLE 4: SELECTED STUDIES OF BILINGUAL CHILDREN IN BERLIN

	DATA COLLECTED where/when	INFORMANTS	METHODOLOGY
I	Ausländerklasse 1978	9-13-year-old Turkish, Greek, Yugoslavian and Lebanese children	Structured interviews in German
II	A) Gesamtschule 1979	A) 7th grade 1/3 Turkish, 2/3 German	Structured interviews  in German
	B) Afternoon school 1979	B) Greek children	
III	"EKMAUS" * KITA Schülerladen Horte 1983 - 1986	5-12-year old Turkish/German bilinguals ; (A,B,C)	Semi-structured experimental interviews in Turkish and German
		monolinguals: Turkish (D) German (E)	
IV	VAK - KITA Project 1987 - longitudinal study	1-6-years old 3 Groups: 1) TT - both parents Turkish 2) DD - both parents German 3) TD - one parent Turkish, one parent German	Semi-structured interviews and recordings in Turkish and German

\* EKMAUS stands for a group of projects on foreign children funded by the Freie Universität Berlin 1983-86 "Entwicklung von Konzepten und Materialien für die Förderung ausländischer Kinder und Jugendlichen im schulischen und ausserschulischen Bereich". Kita, Schülerladen und Horte are different types of day-care centers for pre-school and school-age children. For some results of the studies, see Pfaff, 1980, 1984, 1987, etc.

classes made up exclusively of foreign pupils (Ausländerregelklassen) have been established in districts with high proportions of foreigners. According to the most recent available figures for the school year 1985/86, 5.656 primary school children (26.3%) and 1.683 Hauptschule secondary school pupils (38.2%/. ) attend such Ausländerregelklassen. Although these classes are supposed to follow the same course of studies as those attended by native Germans, the fact that linguistic input and interaction with natives is precluded has obvious negative consequences for German language development.

As far as language education is concerned, the emphasis is still concentrated largely on improving the German language skills of the pupils. Hother tongue instruction, primarily seen as transitional, is available in preparatory classes and in Ausländerklassen; in some schools Turkish as a foreign language is offered in place of English as the first or second foreign language.

Recently, partly in response to discussion of "semilingualism" and the associated claims of cognitive academic deficits stemming from nonstandard production and comprehension in both mother-tongue and German, mother-tongue literacy and bilingual education are being developed and tried out for the initial school years.

## **2. Studies of Bilingual Language of Migrant Children in Berlin**

Since 1978, I have been studying aspects of migrant children's language in Berlin, investigating the linguistic systems of individual children's German and the development of contact-induced ethnic varieties of the mother-tongue in the diaspora. An overview of these studies is given in Table 4.

In the rest of this paper, I focus on the results of the EKMAUS study of the development of nominal reference in the Turkish and German of 5 to 12-year-old Turkish children with various degrees of contact to German natives. An overview of design, methodologies and sociolinguistic features investigated are given in Table 5.

TABLE 6: SAMPLE SCHEMATIC REALIZATIONS OF COMPLEX ACTION

		T-1 = one of three similar items	T-1 = one unique item	T-1 = one of three identical items
TURKISH				
	kızılderilli 'Indian'	mandal 'clothespin'	hemsire 'nurse'	
A S2 09 Ay f 7	<u>Indianer</u>	Ø mama, onu aldı	<u>Fatma'nın</u> yanına götürdü	
B S6 09 Nu f 7	Ø pembeli ...	Ø saçından alıyor ... yerden bir sefer hopluyor üstünden		
C S2 07 Mu m 11	<u>penbe kız</u>	Ø alıyor götürdü	<u>hemsireye</u> veriyor, <u>ikinci hemsire</u>	
D S7 13 Hü f 12	<u>penbe elbiseli kızıl derilli</u>	aldı <u>mandallı</u> mandallı	<u>hasta, doktorun</u> yanına koydu <u>hemsirenin</u> yanına getirdi	
'The Indian in the pink dress takes the clothespin, jumps over it and gives it to one of the nurses'				
GERMAN				
	Punker 'punk'	wäscheklammer 'clothespin'	Mädchen 'girl'	
A S2 09 Ay f 7	<u>der schwarze Junge</u>	hat Ø	zum <u>diese</u> Haare genimmt	
B S6 09 Nu f 7	<u>und dann kommt der schwarzhhaarige Punker</u>	und holt den <u>wäscheklammer</u> und legt den auf's Boden und springt einmal über den <u>wäscheklammer</u> und holt <u>den</u> und bringt <u>ihn</u>	zum <u>das</u> Mädchen	
C S2 07 Mu m 11	<u>eine Junge</u>	hat <u>die Klammer</u> genommen einmal gesprungen dann ist	in <u>eine</u> Mädchen's Füße neben die gelegt	
E S6 14 Ch m 10	<u>der Junge ein Punker</u>	nimmt <u>die Klammer</u> springt darüber und gibt <u>sie</u>	<u>dem</u> Mädchen	

'The black-haired punk takes the clothespin, jumps over it and gives it to one of the girls'

TABLE 7: SELF-REPORTS OF LANGUAGE USE BY BILINGUAL CHILDREN

CHILD *	Birth-place	Family			School						
		Language in Family with Parents	with Siblings	Language with Friends	Grade	Type A/R <sup>a</sup>	Teacher	Language in School Instruction	Recess	Literacy reads	writes
A S3 04 Mu m 5		T	T	T	Kita	A	TK	T	T	---	---
A S2 09 Ay f 7	Blm	T	T	T	1st	A	T/D	T	T	---	---
A S2 06 Hu f 7	Blm	T	T	T	VOR-Schule	(no Turks)	T/D	D	---	(T)	---
A S2 02 Ok m 7	T	T	T		1st	A	T/D?	T			
A S2 08 Ha f 9		T	T		1st	A	T	D		(D)	(D)
A S2 11 Se f 9	Blm	T	T		1st	A	D/T	D/T	T	D	D
A S2 05 Mu m 10	Blm	T	T/D	T	4th	A	T/D	D/T	T	D/(T)	D
A S2 04 U1 f 11	Blm	T			4th	A		D			
B S5 01 De f 6	Blm	T	T	D/T	VOR-schule	(2/3 Turks)	D/T	D/T	D/T	---	---
B S5 02 Se m 6	Blm	T/D	T/D	D/T	VOR-schule	(2/3 Turks)	D/T	D/T	D/T	---	---
B S6 08 Nu f 7		D/T	D/T		1st	R (2) M (1)	D	D			D
B S6 01 Oz f 8	Blm	D/T			3rd	A	D/T	D/T		D/(T)	D/T
B S6 04 Ed f 8	Blm	D/(T)	T	D	2nd	A	D/T	D	D	D/(T)	D
B S2 03 Ay f 9	Blm	D/T	D/T	D/T	2nd	(1/4 Turks)	D	D	D/T	D/T	D/T
B S6 09 N1 f 10	BRD	T/D	T/D	D/T	3rd	A		D	D/T	D/T	D/T
B S6 06 Ha m 10	Blm	T/D	T/D	D/T	4th	R (5) Turks)		D/T	D/T	D	D/T
B S2 12 Ce m 11	Blm	D/T	D/T		3rd	R (4) Turks)		T/D	T	D/(T)	D/T
C S8 01 Ae m 10	T	T/D	T/D		2nd	R (1) Turks)				D/T	D/T
C S8 02 Gu f 11	T	T/D	T/D		1st	R (4) Turks)	D	D		D/T	D/T
C S2 07 Mu m 11	T	T	T	T	4th	A		D	T	D/T	D/T
C S2 10 Bi m 11	T	T/D	T/D		2nd	A		D	T	D/T	D/T

\*Groups A, B and C are based on contact with native Germans and age of onset of acquisition of German.

S1, S2 ... code the day-care centers where the interviews were conducted.

01, 02 ... plus abbreviated first name, sex and age code the individual child.

<sup>a</sup>class types: A = Ausländerregelklasse, R = Regelklasse



Turkish

**TABLE 5: EKMAUS: DESIGN, METHODOLOGY AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES INVESTIGATED**

**EKMAUS Subjects**

- Group A. In Germany from birth or early age, little contact with native German peers.
- Group B. In Germany from birth or early age, considerable contact with native German peers.
- Group C. Entered Germany after early childhood, two or more years of school in Turkey.
- Group D. Monolingual control group: Turkish children in Ankara.
- Group E. Monolingual control group: German children in Berlin.

**EKMAUS Elicitation games and linguistic variables**

- BACKGROUND:** language use in family, with friends, at school, contact with Turkey, plans to return or stay.
- PLAYROOMS:** production and comprehension of definite and indefinite reference.
- STORIES:** production of connected narrative, comprehension of definite and indefinite.
- MEMORY:** production of naming, definite and indefinite reference.
- ACTIONS:** production of definite/indefinite reference in various case frames.
- STORIES:** comprehension and production of definite and indefinite reference with toys, verbal and pictorial stimuli.
- CONVERSATION** interspersed with games, personal narratives.

The methodology has been described fully in Pfaff et al. 1985. By way of illustration, some examples from the ACTIONS game are given in the following chart in Table 6.

Utterances were elicited as descriptions of actions which the interviewer performed with sets of toys. These ACTIONS were designed to elicit expressions referring to participants in various case roles or grammatical relations (subject, direct object, indirect object) and spatial relations ('into', 'over', 'beside'...). The sets of toys included some which were unique (T-1), for example a single clothespin; similar (T-s), for example dolls representing punks with different colored hair or Indians with different colored dresses; or identical (T-i), for example identical girl triplets or nurses. See the examples in Table 6 for schematic representations of sample ACTIONS in Turkish and German.

### **3. Results: Patterns of Language Choice**

To begin our discussion of bilingual language use in this diaspora setting, a brief overview of the patterns of language contact and language choice in our population of school children is helpful. Table 7 summarizes the self-reported use of Turkish and German at home and at school for a subset of 21 bilingual children from Groups A, B and C.

As shown in Table 7, the differing extent of contact with native Germans characteristic of the two groups born in Berlin has obvious consequences for their language choice. All of the Group A children report using Turkish with their parents and also with siblings and friends most of the time. In contrast, all of the Group B children report using both German and Turkish with family and friends. Some of the younger Group A children use only Turkish at school, while all of the Group B children use German as well; for most B's, German is the dominant language at school.

In the following sections, we turn to the linguistic reflections of these patterns of contact and language use.

#### 4. Quantitative Overview of Diaspora Varieties of Bilinguals

Before discussing some of the particular linguistic features of Turkish and German, it is important to put the details into perspective. Table 8 gives a quantitative overview of four measures: (1) nonstandard vocabulary, (2) code-switching and mixing, (3) nonstandard morphosyntax and (4) self-corrections.

TABLE 8: GROUP MEAN VALUES (\*) FOR SELECTED LINGUISTIC MEASURES IN GERMAN AND TURKISH

Group		nonstandard vocabulary	code-switching	nstd morpho-syntax	self-corrected form
A (n=7)	DT	2%	.3%	13.1%	.4%
	TK	2%	1.1%	2.5%	.3%
B (n=9)	DT	1.2%	.1%	8.7%	.4%
	TK	1.4%	2.1%	3.4%	.3%
C (n=4)	DT	1.3%	.1%	12.9%	.6%
	TK	1.2%	.9%	2.3%	.3%
D (n=4)	TK	.4%	-	1.6%	.1%
E (n=4)	DT	1.2%	-	3.5%	.4%

(\*) based on subsample of 28 children

Examples of each of these features are given in the sample ACTIONS responses in Table 6. Nonstandard vocabulary includes items

such as *mama* for *mandai* 'clothespin' in Turkish in the response of the seven-year-old Group A girl. The sentence also illustrates mixing a German noun, *Indianer* into Turkish and what may be a self-correction of demonstrative adjective plus unmarked direct object *o mama* 'that clothespin' to the definite accusative pronoun *onu* 'it'. The same girl's response in German illustrates nonstandard morphosyntax in null anaphora for the object, an overgeneralized participial form *genimmt* rather than standard *genommen* 'took' and in her apparent reanalysis of the form *zum*, a standard contraction of the preposition *zu* plus definite article *dem* 'to the', as an independent prepositional form which can precede another determiner as in *zum diese Haare*, 'to this one's hair\*'. A similar example is found in the Group B example *zum das Mädchen* 'to the girl\*.

As shown in Table 8, the degree of nonstandardness is, in general, quite low. The vast majority of forms and usage by all children in both languages are those used by monolingual children. The highest values are for nonstandard morphosyntax in German, which can be explained by the high degree of irregularity and unpredictability of standard German. Note that our monolingual German control group also produced nonstandard forms. Similar results are reported in studies of monolingual language acquisition summarized in Hills, 1985.

Our finding that the proportion of standard realizations of Turkish morphosyntax is so much higher, reflects the well-known regularity of Turkish, which is also seen in the early, generally error-free acquisition of morphology by monolinguals reported by Ekmekçi 1979 and Aksu-Koc and Slobin 1985.

The differences between Groups A and B, the bilingual groups born in Berlin which differ in the extent of contact to German, and the third bilingual Group C, which immigrated to Berlin after several years of school in Turkey, are small but always in the direction which would be expected on the basis of their contact with native speakers and the age at which their second language acquisition began.

The percentage of nonstandard forms of lexical items for content words for Turkish and German is more or less identical for both

languages. Group A has the most nonstandard forms, but these constitute only 27. of the total vocabulary. Groups B, C and E are approximately the same; Group D has the lowest rate.

The rate of code-switching and mixing from Turkish into German, which will be discussed in greater detail in 5.1., is higher than the rate of switching in the opposite direction for all the bilingual groups. However, the extent of contact with native speakers is reflected in the differences between Groups A and B. Switching from German into Turkish, Group A, with little contact with Germans, is higher. In contrast, switches from Turkish into German, Group B, which has more contact with Germans, is higher.

For nonstandard morphosyntax, some aspects of which will be discussed in more detail in 3.2 and 5.3, the figures for German are considerably higher than those for Turkish, reflecting, on the one hand, the greater irregularity of German noted above and, on the other hand, the fact that the mother-tongue of all the bilingual groups is relatively intact in this respect while the second language is still noticeably nonstandard. For German, Group B is considerably more standard than Groups A and C, reflecting their greater contact with native speakers. Their Turkish, in contrast, is slightly less standard than the other two bilingual groups, an indication of incipient language loss for children whose use of Turkish is least frequent. As noted above, the monolingual control groups both show a certain degree of nonstandardness, demonstrating that some nonstandard morphosyntax is simply characteristic of child language and has nothing to do with bilingualism.

The figures for self-correction of forms reflect the children's awareness of standard and nonstandard morphology as well as the amount of monitoring of speech they do as they talk. For all groups, the figures for self-correction are higher for German than for Turkish, indicating that the typological differences may be reflected in this aspect of the children's behavior as well. The Group C mean for self-correction in German is the highest of all, which may be attributed to their greater conscious awareness of formal aspects of their second language as a result of beginning to learn it at a comparatively advanced stage of development with support from formal instruction at school.

## 5. Some Linguistic Features of Bilinguals' Turkish and German

In the remainder of this paper, I briefly examine some of the results for individual children of Groups A, B and C for evidence of language contact effects in the lexicon and selected morphosyn-tactic aspects of the nominal reference subsystems.

### 5.1 Lexical mixing and code-switching

In general, in language-contact situations, one of the earliest noted and most prevalent effects is that of lexical borrowing which may begin even before fluent bilingualism is common and may persist long after language shift has prevailed in the migrant population. During phases of bilingualism, various types of code-switching are commonly found as well, ranging from situational and metaphorical switching to the use of varieties with frequent intrasentential in casual interaction among bilingual speakers.

Table 9 gives an overview of the frequencies of lexical mixing and code-switching by individual speakers in both Turkish and German interviews. For Turkish, our focus here, these results are further broken down into the syntactic category of the items switched.

Note that the overall percentages of mixing, calculated as a ratio of mixed items to total word tokens, is very low for both languages. All children mix some German lexical items in their Turkish, but the percentages range from 0.2% to 2.4% with one exceptional case, an eight-year-old girl from Group B, whose vocabulary in the Turkish interview includes *b'*. German lexical items. As predicted by their more extensive contact with Germans, the group B children in general show higher frequencies of German lexical items in their Turkish than the Group A children.

For all bilinguals except one Group A child, the frequency of mixing Turkish into German is lower than the mixing in the opposite direction. Two children, both from Group B, show no mixing at all, and in general, as could be predicted by their more limited contacts with German, the Group A children show higher frequencies than the Group B children. One interactional factor which may well

TABLE 9: CODE-SWITCHING AND MIXING

CHILD	SWITCHES TO GERMAN IN TURKISH INTERVIEW													TK IN DT					
	number of instances	total vocabulary	percent	nouns	verbs	adjectives	interjections	conjunctions	adverbs	telling time	article + noun	adjective + noun	mixed compound	prepositional phrase	verb phrase	sentence	number of instances	total vocabulary	percent
A S3 04 Mu m 5	4	1354	0.3	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-			
A S2 09 Ay w 7	31	1933	1.6	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	2179	0.3
A S2 06 Hü w 7	31	1314	2.4	29	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	1699	0.7
A S2 09 Ha w 9	6	3408	0.2	3	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	2927	0.4
A S2 11 Şe w 9	14	1772	0.8	8	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	3120	0.4
B S5 01 De w 6	45	1820	2.3	23	2	4	3	1	-	1	1	1	4	-	5	14	5493	0.2	
B S5 02 Se m 6	31	1295	2.4	25	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	13	3137	0.4	
B S6 08 Nu w 7	89	6735	1.3	59	6	14	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	9	7	4945	0.1	
B S6 01 Öz w 8	26	4872	0.5	21	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	5233	0.1	
B S6 04 Eb w 8	163	2704	6.0	106	15	4	4	1	4	5	1	-	2	1	20	-	2981	-	
B S6 09 Ni w 10	50	4335	1.7	45	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	5287	0.0	
B S6 06 Ha m 10	31	2905	1.1	23	2	-	4	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	6	3631	0.2	
B S2 12 Ce m 11	9	1223	0.7	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2400	-
C S8 01 At m 10	39	3261	1.2	19	2	1	11	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5	3	2674	0.1	
C S8 02 Gü w 11	26	2961	0.9	21	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	1	1678	0.0	
C S2 07 Mu m 11	4	1501	0.3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	2978	0.1	
C S2 10 Bi m 11	21	1817	1.2	18	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	2635	0.3	

play a role here is that the children could assume that the Turkish interviewers, like themselves, native speakers of Turkish but living in Germany, are also bilingual; while the German interviewers could not be presumed to know Turkish.

These results indicate that, whether or not these children also engage in conversational code-switching as a stylistic option in casual interaction with other bilinguals, they clearly maintain separate functioning systems for more formal registers such as the present interactions with adult interviewers.

With respect to the grammar of mixed utterances, we find that the extent of contact with German appears to play a role in the constraints on mixing. The Group B children mix in a wider range of syntactic) categories, as shown in Table 9.

All bilingual children of all groups use German nouns with Turkish inflectional morphology suffixed to mark case as in (1)-(2):<sup>1</sup>

- (1) Rollerschuheplatz'a gittik                      A S2 09 Ay f 7  
'we went to the rollerskating rink'
- (2) Türkiye'de Kinderzimmer'im var                      B S6 04 Eb f 8  
'I have my own room in Turkey'

Adjectives, interjections and conjunctions were also mixed in the speech of individuals of all groups. Derivational morphology such as the denominal suffix *-li* were supplied as in (3)-(4):

- (3) benim babam krank'li                      A S2 09 Ha f 9  
'my father is sick'
- (4) sarı *gelb'li* topu çaldın                      B S6 08 Nu f 7  
'you took away the yellow, yellow ball'

or the mixed forms were uninflected, as in (5) and (6):



Carol W. Pfaff

(5) *bir tane weiss balonu* B S6 04 Eb f 8  
'one white ballon'

(6) *domuz oder eşek* B S6 08 Nu f 7  
'pig or donkey'

In contrast, only children from Groups B and C switched verbs. Unlike nouns, German verbs were seldom given Turkish inflections as in (7):

(7) *çiçekler planz'iyomuş* B S6 08 Nu f 7  
'he was planting flowers'

More typically, German verbs were used in the infinitive form in combination with an inflected form of the Turkish verb *yapmak* 'make' or 'do' as in (8)-(9):

(8) *bakma schurmeIn yaparsın* B S6 09 Ni f 10  
'don't look, you're cheating!'

(9) *Peter arabayı schieben yapıyo* B S6 04 Eb f 8  
'Peter pushes the car'

This tendency to restrict verb switching to nonfinite forms is reminiscent of the Spanish/English switching pattern in which English verbs occur as participles (with Spanish participial endings) after inflected Spanish auxiliary verbs (Pfaff 1979). In the case of Turkish/German, the constraints on mixing appear to be even more strict because Turkish does not share the Auxiliary + Verb typology with German.

Sentential switches into German were never used by the Group A children. In the B and C groups, they occurred mainly in the PLAYROOMS game where the children had to request toys from dolls they had named. Several Group B and C children gave the dolls German names such as Steffi and Peter, thus requests addressed to them in German were appropriate. The Group A children all chose to call the dolls Turkish names such as Ali and GÜlay, thus addressing them appropriately in Turkish.

## 5.2 Cas Marking in Turkish

Case marking in Turkish is well-known for its transparency and regularity; suffixes are given in Table 10. The allomorphs of the inflections follow regular phonological rules of vowel harmony, consonant harmony (voicing assimilation) and the insertion of a nasal or glide between sequences of vowels which would arise when vowel-initial suffixes are added to stems ending in vowels, as shown in Table 10:

TABLE 10: STANDARD TURKISH CASE FORMS

		'cow'	'clothe- spin'	'ball'	'eye'
NOMINATIVE	- ∅	inek	mandal	top	göz
GENITIVE	-(n) in/ın/un/ün	ineğin	mandalın	topun	gözün
ACCUSATIVE	-(y) i/ı/u/ü	ineği	mandalı	topu	gözü
DATIVE	- e/a	ineğe	mandala	topa	göze
LOCATIVE	- de/da/te/ta	inekte	mandalda	topta	gözde
ABLATIVE	- den/dan/ten/tan	inekten	mandaldan	toptan	gözden
INSTRUMENTAL/ COMITATIVE	- le/la	inekle	mandalla	topla	gözle

As illustrated by the forms for 'clothespin', 'ball' and 'eye', the case inflections are generally attached to the stem which is unaltered in form from the uninflected nominative. There is, however, a minimal amount of phonologically conditioned stem alternation for stems ending in /k/ as in the word for 'cow' where the /k/ becomes /g/ (*yumusak g*) realized phonetically as a glide or unrealized before suffixes which begin with vowels.

As noted above, studies of monolingual Turkish first language acquisition have demonstrated that these case markers are acquired easily and, in comparison to languages with less transparent systems, very early, by the age of two. In our study of the acquisition of Turkish of bilingual children, we have parallel results. In contrast to other diaspora languages which have more opaque case-marking systems which are lost or reduced in the diaspora as is

TABLE 11: REALIZATION OF CASE IN TURKISH ACTIONS SETS 4 AND 5 \*

CHILD	SUBJECT	DIR. OBJECT	IND. OBJECT	GOAL	'beside' 'in front of'	'from'	'over'	Percent Nonstandard
A S3 04 Mu m 5	5	3 (1)		9	8	-	-	4
A S2 09 AY f 7	11	8		8	7	4	1	0
A S2 06 HU f 7	10	9		10	10	3	-	0
A S2 08 Ha f 9	8	4		12	1	2	-	0
A S2 11 Şe f 9	10	10		11	3	8	1	0
B S5 01 De f 6	10(1)	4		12	-	5	2	3
B S5 02 Se m 6	11	11		14	-	1	2	0
B S6 08 Nu f 7	11	8		13	-	6	2	0
B S6 01 Öz f 8	11	11		12(1)	-	5	2	2
B S6 04 Eb f 8	12(1)	10		10(2)	-	-	2	8
B S6 09 N1 f 10	11	11		13	1	6	1	0
B S6 06 Ha m 10	13	11		13(1)	-	7	1	2
B S2 12 Ce m 11	10	10		12	7	-	1	0
C S8 01 At m 10	10	9		11	-	2	1	0
C S8 02 GÜ f 11	11	10(1)		12	-	6	2	2
C S2 07 Mu m 11	10	7		11	9	-	-	0
C S2 10 B1 m 11	12	9		10	-	-	1	0
D S7 01 Fa f 5	10	8 (1)		12	4	-	-	3
D S7 02 Is m 6	11	10		11	8	1	2	0
D S7 09 Fe m 9	12	10		12	4	-	2	0
D S7 13 Hü f 12	10	11		10	10	-	2	0

\* Nonstandard realizations of case are parenthesized.



Carol W. Pfaff

(13) *manda* (NOM)    *mandayı* (ACC)    A S2 06 Hi f 7

(14) *mantar*(NOM)    *mantarı* (ACC)    A S2 08 Ha f 9

A further error involving the stem rather than case marking *per se* is shown by forms such as (11) above in which the allomorphic alternation of *k-ğ* is lost and the basic form with /k/ overgeneralized. Another example is:

(15) *ineke* for *ineğe*    B S5 01 De f 6  
'to the cow'

Marking of noun phrases with modifiers poses more of a problem than marking in the unmodified noun phrases we have been discussing. The Group B children particularly tend to overuse combined forms with genitive-possessive marking.

(16) *bi tane hemşiresi*    B S6 04 Eb f 8  
for *bi tane hemşire*  
'one nurse'

(17) *Indianer'in pembesi*    B S6 04 Eb f 8  
for *pembeli Indianer*  
'the pink-dressed Indian'

Both (16) and (17) show an overgeneralization of the possessive which is used for compounding nouns in standard Turkish. In (17) we find a complete possessive construction, marked with genitive case on the first member and possessive on the second, the meaning of this structure, however, would have to be 'the Indian's pink' but, from the context of the ACTIONS game, the intended meaning was clearly 'the pink Indian'. In these examples, we find no erosion of the case **forms**, but rather of their **functions** which appear to become more generalized markers of syntactic combination rather than marking particular structural relations.<sup>2</sup>

### 5.3. Number Harking

A different type of systematic change in the nominal reference markers we have noted in children's language in the diaspora is found in the use of the plural suffix *-ler/-lar*, an extremely regular marker with alternants conditioned only by vowel harmony and not involving any concomitant stem changes. In standard Turkish, this marker is used with plural nouns only when the noun phrase is not otherwise marked for plurality, as for example with plural quantifiers such as *iki* 'two', *iç* 'three' or *çok* 'many'. Examples are shown in Table 12:

**TABLE 12: STANDARD TURKISH PLURAL MARKING**

singular		plural		with plural quantifier	
<i>inek</i>	'cow'	<i>inekler</i>	'cows'	<i>iki inek</i>	'two cows'
<i>at</i>	'horse'	<i>atlar</i>	'horses'	<i>üç at</i>	'three horses'
<i>çiçek</i>	'flower'	<i>çiçekler</i>	'flowers'	<i>çok çiçek</i>	'many flowers'

As Nilsson 1985, following Grönbeck 1936 and Pritsak 1963, has pointed out, plural marking appears to be a relatively recent historical innovation in Turkish which began in the ninth century under the influence of contact with Indo-European languages. It is interesting to see whether this category will continue to change in the diaspora with renewed intensive contact to German, an Indo-European language which marks plural on articles and nouns whether or not the noun phrase is otherwise marked as plural. Similarly, it is possible that the Turkish system would influence the German acquired by children in the diaspora, either as direct transfer in second language acquisition, or as a result of the development of ethnic varieties of German spoken in the Turkish community.

We examined the data in both Turkish and German for plural quantified noun phrases. The results shown in Table 13 indicate there may be cross-language transfer in both directions.

TABLE 13: PLURAL MARKING ON NOUNS IN PLURAL QUANTIFIED NOUN PHRASES

CHILD	TURKISH			GERMAN		
	marked plural	unmarked plural	Percent * Nonstandard	marked plural	unmarked plural	Percent * Nonstandard
A S3 04 Mu m 5	1	11	8	-	-	-
A S2 09 Ay f 7	0	10	0	1	0	(0)
A S2 06 HÜ f 7	1	3	(25)	8	10	44
A S2 02 Ok m 7	-	-	-	13	7	35
A S2 08 Ha f 9	2	23	8	1	3	(75)
A S2 11 Se f 9	0	5	(0)	8	7	47
A S2 05 Mu m 10	-	-	-	16	0	0
A S2 01 Ul f 11	-	-	-	8	8	50
B S5 01 De f 6	0	20	0	7	2	22
B S5 02 Se m 6	0	21	0	8	7	58
B S6 08 Nu f 7	5	20	20	2	17	89
B S6 01 Öz f 8	3	48	6	33	2	6
B S6 04 Eb f 8	2	20	9	10	1	9
B S2 03 Ay f 9	-	-	-	1	4	(80)
B S6 09 Ni f 10	2	26	7	19	4	18
B S6 06 Ha m 10	0	23	0	16	0	0
B S2 12 Ce m 11	0	7	0	9	3	25
C S8 01 At m 10	0	29	0	12	5	29
C SB 02 QU f 11	0	21	0	4	2	33
C S2 07 Mu m 11	0	5	0	9	22	71
C S2 10 Bl m 11	2	14	12	4	6	60
C S2 01 Bu m 12	-	-	-	5	2	28
D S7 01 Fa f 5	-	-	-			
D S7 02 Is m 6	-	-	-			
D S7 09 Fe m 9	0	7	0			
D S7 13 Hü f 12	1	4	(20)			
E S9 01 Ma m 5				4	1	(20)
E S4 08 Ma f 7				14	2	12
E S9 02 Si f 8				23	0	0
E S6 14 Ch m 10				14	0	0

**\*Percentages based on five or fewer instances are parenthesized. For Turkish, marked plural is nonstandard; for German, unmarked plural is nonstandard.**

### 5.3.1. Overmarking of Plural in Turkish

As shown in Table 13, the extent of such transfer from German to Turkish is quite limited. Only a few children in each group show any instances of overmarking of plural noun phrases and, for those who do, the percentage is low, ranging from 67. to 25%. Further, it should be noted, that the instances of nonstandard overmarking are only rarely in simple quantified noun phrases such as the examples in Table 12. Occurrences such as (1B)-(19) are found, but infrequently:

(18) *üç dene ördekler* A S2 08 Ha f 9  
'three ducks'

(19) *üç tane balonlar* B S6 09 Ni f 10  
'three balloons'

Overmarking of plurality is more likely to occur in contexts which are morphologically and/or syntactically more complex. In morphologically complex examples, the plural occurs together with other agglutinated morphemes, as in (20)-(21):

(20) *Ali senin üç balonların da verir misin?* B S6 01 Üz f 8  
'Ali, would you give (me) your three balloons?'

(21) *Ayhan senin üç tane toplardan bir sarı topun* B S6 09 Ni f 10  
'Ayhan, from your three balls, one yellow ball.'

One context in which nonstandard overmarking of plurality was produced by several children who otherwise had standard realizations, is modifying phrases in which the children attempted to distinguish between rearing and standing horses. These are frequently described as 'the horse (standing) on two legs' and 'the horse (standing) on four legs'. Nonstandard examples are shown in (22)-(23):



- (22) iki ayakları havada                      B S6 08 Nu f 7  
'two legs in the air'
- (23) dört ayakları yerde at                      C S2 10 Bi m 11  
'four legs on the ground horse'

### 5.3.2. Undermarking of Plural in German

Turning to the German results, we find, in contrast, that nearly all of the bilingual children and one of the monolinguals undermark plurality in plural quantified noun phrases, and that they do so with rather high frequencies, ranging up to 89% (the monolingual child's percentage is 12). Further, these instances of undermarking in German typically occur in simple quantified noun phrases such as (24)–(25):

- (24) zwei Ball            for *zwei Bälle*                      A S2 08 Ha f 9  
'two balls'
- (25) drei Auto            for *drei Autos*                      B S5 01 De f 6  
'three cars'

One typological factor which may contribute to the apparent permeability of the German plural marking system is the irregularity of the standard German which has several plural formation classes with and without umlauting, with and without vocalic or consonantal suffixation of various phonological forms.

## 6. Conclusions

This brief examination of some features of the varieties of Turkish and German spoken by migrant children, enable us to discern the workings of some social and linguistic factors which influence usage in this diaspora setting.

First, most generally, although language shift is taking place here, it is proceeding rather slowly. This is seen both in the self-reports of language use and in the relatively low incidence of

non-standard realizations of Turkish linguistic features examined here, particularly among the Group A children who have little contact to native Germans. Their rather strong tendency toward language retention follows clearly from the social and educational conditions in which they acquire and use their languages.

Second, we see evidence that the typology of Turkish plays a significant role in the nature and extent to which the diaspora varieties are permeable by German. Even within the lexicon, where we find the inevitable evidence of language mixing, borrowing and code-switching, the syntactic constraints on such mixing of German into Turkish is, particularly for the Group A children, rather sharply limited, primarily to nouns onto which Turkish inflections are readily suffixed. Mixing of German verbs into Turkish, found among Group B children is most likely to take place with a nominalized infinitive form of the German verb together with a neutral Turkish verb such as *yapmak* 'make, do' receiving the tense and personal inflection.

Third, in contrast to the lexical inventory where the direction of influence in the diaspora is as expected from German to Turkish, the formal morphosyntactic system seems to be rather resistant to permeation by German. Case marking and other inflectional nominal morphology such as plural, appear in general to be robust subsystems. Their erosion, limited as it is, seems to begin in morphologically and syntactically complex structures. The complexity of marking modifier-head combinations seems also to contribute to the weakening of the semantic function and syntactic placement rules for derivational affixes.

Finally, the findings for German are in general parallel and complementary to those for Turkish, and can likewise be accounted for in terms of some of the most obvious social and linguistic factors. Thus, the Group B children, with more contact to native Germans, report more extensive use of German with family and friends, show a wider range of German lexical items mixed into their Turkish and have lower rates of nonstandard realization of the German nominal reference features examined here. The plurifunctional fusional and irregular morphology of German, particularly of the plural marking on nouns, appears to make this subsystem at least at this phase, more permeable to the influence of Turkish. This study provides a static glimpse of ongoing development of language varieties

in diaspora which reflect both diachronic change and individual language acquisition. Whether or not these processes continue along these lines, intensify or reverse their course will depend as much on the (changing) social conditions for the speakers as on the typological characteristics of the languages in contact.

### NOTES

1. In the following examples, the apostrophe has been used to separate the German lexical item from its Turkish suffix. In standard Turkish orthography, the apostrophe is used to separate proper nouns from their suffixes, as in *Tiirkiye'de*,
2. A possibly parallel weakening in the system of derivational morphology is found with the denominal adjective forming suffix *-li/ -lu/ -lü*. Here too we find the form attached to the head rather than to the modifying color name in the modified noun phrase:

(a) *kirmizi Indianern* 'the red Indian' A S2 06 Hü f 7

(b) *yesil Indianern* 'the green Indian' B S5 01 De f 6

Such constructions are rare, however, and alternate with standard forms such as *pembe ku* 'the pink girl' and *pem-beli kiz* 'the pink-dressed girl'.

## REFERENCES

- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan a Dan I. Slobin: 1985, 'Acquisition of Turkish' in: Dan I. Slobin (ed.), *The Cross-Linguistic Study of Language Acquisition*, Vol. 1, 839-878, Hillsdale, N.J.
- Cummins, J.: 1984, *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*, Clevedon.
- Đurovič, L': 1983, 'The Case Systems in the Language of Diaspora Children', in: Đurovič, *il. (ed.), L/ngua in Diaspora. Studies in the Language of the Second Generation of Yugoslav Immigrant Children in Sweden* (= Slavica Lundensia 9), Lund, 21-94.
- Ekmekçi, Ozden F.: 1979, *Acquisition of Turkish: A Longitudinal Study on the Early Language Development of a Turkish Child*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Grönbeck, K.: 1936, *Der türkische Sprachbau*, Copenhagen.
- Karmiloff-Smith, Annette: 1979, *A functional Approach to Child Language: A Study of Determiners and Reference*, Cambridge.
- Mills, Ann E.: 1985, 'The Acquisition of German', in: Dan I. Slobin (ed.), *The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition*, Vol. 1, Hillsdale, N.J., 141-255.
- Nilsson, Birgit: 1985, *Case Harking Semantics in Turkish*, Dissertation, Stockholm University, Stockholm.
- Pfaff, Carol W.: 1979, 'Constraints on Language Mixing: intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English', *Language* 55, 291-318. Reprinted in J. Amastae a L. Elias-Olivares (eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Aspects*, 1962, Cambridge, 264-298.
- Pfaff, Carol WV. 1980a, 'Cross-language reference in bilingual discourse', in: Roger W. Shuy a Anna Shnukal (eds.), *Language Use and the Uses of Language*, 98-110.
- Pfaff, Carol W.s 1960b, 'Lexicalization in Black English', in: R. Day (ed.), *Issues in English Creoles*, Heidelberg, 163-180.
- Pfaff, Carol W.: 1984, 'On input and residual L<sub>1</sub> transfer effects in Turkish and Greek Children's German', in: R. Andersen (ed.), *Second Languages*, Rowley, Mass., 271-298.
- Pfaff, Carol W.s 1965, »The Problem of Plurifunctionality in Bilingual Language Acquisition', *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development* 24, 95-103.

- Pfaff, Carol W.: 1987, 'Functional approaches to interlanguage', im Carol W. Pfaff (ed.) *First and Second Language Acquisition Processes*, Rowley, Mass., 81-102.
- Pfaff, Carol W. et al.: 1985, *Bericht EKHAUS Teil projekt: Linguistische and kognitive Entwicklung: Die Beziehung zwischen Erst- und Zweitspracherwerb*.
- Pfaff, Carol W. & Portz, Renate: 1981, 'Foreign children's acquisition of German: universals vs. interference', in: Dittmar J (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second German-Scandinavian Conference on Migrant Language*, Berlin.
- Pritsak, O.: 1963, *Pas Altürkische Handbuch der Orientalistik* 1.51, edited by B. Spuler, Leiden - Köln, 27-52.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove: 1984, *Bilingualism or Not: The Education De of Minorities*, Translated by L. Halmberg and D. Crane, Clevedon. *Statistisches Landesamt Berlin* 1986, 1987: *Berliner Statistik*.
- Steinmüller, Ulrich.: 1986, 'Probleme der schulischen Integration von Kindern und des Spracherwerbs', Beitrag zur Tagung "Türken in Berlin - Mexikaner in Los Angeles" im Reichstagsgebäude in Berlin, 18.-23. September 1986.