NADIA EVERSTEIJN
Tilburg University

# TURKISH-DUTCH LANGUAGE CHOICE IN ADULT-CHILD INTERACTION IN LOMBOK UTRECHT, THE NETHERLANDS

This article reports on a study of language choice among fifty Turkish - Dutch bilingual teenagers living in the multicultural neighborhood of Lombok/Transvaal in Utrecht, the Netherlands, during intra-ethnic conversations, especially with adults. In an interview, the informants were asked which language register they usually speak with several interlocutors in a number of different settings, and for what reasons they codeswitch. It appears that a language shift is taking place over generations: grandparents are almost exclusively addressed in Turkish, while Dutch is used extensively with elder sisters and brothers. Furthermore, it turns out that a significant correlation exists between the language register used with a given interlocutor, and the rating the informant assigns to the Dutch language proficiency of that interlocutor. All determinants of language choice and codeswitching reported by the informants can be categorized according to the classification of Appel & Muysken (1987). In this article all subcategories of this classification will be illustrated by quotations from the data.

## Introduction

The doctoral research reported on in this article is part of TCULT, a study on languages and cultures in the multilingual and multicultural neighborhood Lombok/Transvaal in Utrecht, the Netherlands, in which nineteen linguists and ethnologists from five different institutes and universities are collaborating. According to information from the local city council, on the first of January 1999, 12,5% percent of the population from Lombok/Transvaal (932 persons) were of Turkish descent, meaning these persons themselves or at least one of their parents were born in Turkey (Aarssen & Jongenburger, 2000). The first generation Turkish immigrants came to the Netherlands in the late sixties when Dutch companies started recruiting male employees for unskilled jobs in the Mediterranean countries. As a consequence of family reunion, many women and children arrived in the Netherlands in the late seventies and in the

---

[1] Address for correspondence: Nadia Eversteijn-Kluitmans, Babylon, Center for Studies of Multilingualism in a Multicultural Society, Tilburg University, PO Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands. E-mail: nadia.eversteijn@kub.nl

eighties. The members of the first generation can be expected to be highly dominant in the Turkish language. However, most Turkish teenagers who nowadays populate the streets, schools and youth centres in Lombok/Transvaal are born in Holland, and can be expected to be highly competent in both Turkish and Dutch languages, because most of them have been attending Dutch schools from first grade on, while Turkish is maintained as the home language. The goal of this research is to examine the factors that may determine the choice of one language or the other in intra-ethnic conversations by these teenagers, and the reasons for codeswitches. This article will focus on language choice and codeswitching during conversations of teenagers in contact with several adult interlocutors, such as parents, grandparents, teachers and shop owners.

A comment is needed about the concepts of *language choice* and *codeswitching*. Both concepts are closely linked, as can be concluded from the observation that, throughout the literature, factors used to account for language choice and codeswitching often overlap (Appel & Muysken, 1987). Let us take the example of a shop owner who is talking to a customer in language A about the goods he is selling him, but switches to language B when inquiring after the health of a particular family member of the customer. Fishman (1971) would argue that the role relationship between the interlocutors had changed during their conversation: first they were talking in the role of trader and customer, after which they started talking in the role of personal acquaintances. Since the whole social situation had changed, the speakers needed to redefine the most appropriate *language choice*. Blom and Gumperz (1972), on the other hand, would argue that the switch from language A to language B was a case of metaphorical *codeswitching*: the speakers prefer the more informal "we-code", i.e. the minority language, where personal matters are concerned. In the current study, language choice from a macro-societal perspective, on the one hand, and codeswitching from a micro-interactional perspective, on the other (Li Wei, 1994) are considered to be two ends of a continuum. In this article, the term 'language choice' will be used to refer to both language choice and codeswitching.

The assumption was made that *language proficiency* exerts a particularly strong influence on language choice (Van Avermaet & Klatter-Folmer, 1997; Van Steensel, 2000). Bilingual persons who have an imbalanced proficiency in two languages will be inclined to speak the dominant language most of the time, due to their limited ability to express themselves properly in the non-dominant language. There is an actual risk that the influence of language proficiency on language choice is so strong that it would cover up other factors of importance for language choice. This was taken into account in the selection of informants: it was decided to select only those teenagers who could be expected to have a roughly balanced proficiency in Turkish and Dutch.

**Method**

Informants were contacted through secondary schools, Turkish youth organizations and community centres in the neighborhood of Lombok/Transvaal and its direct environment. Involved in the study were only those teenagers of Turkish descent who

were born in the Netherlands or who had come to this country before the age of five. This was done to ensure that all informants had started to acquire Dutch as a second language not later than at the age of four, at the beginning of primary education, so all of them could be expected to be rather balanced bilinguals. This article will report on the interviews that were held with fifty informants, twenty-six of them girls and twenty-four boys. At the moment of the interview, the youngest informant was aged eleven and the oldest nineteen, while the mean age was fourteen. Only eight teenagers were not born in the Netherlands but in Turkey; they arrived in the Netherlands between the age of one month and four years. All parents of the informants were born in Turkey and came to the Netherlands either as a first generation immigrant, or as an intermediate generation immigrant, i.e. they came to the country as a consequence of family reunion at an age somewhere between five and twelve (see also Backus, 1996). The informants were presented with two question lists, i.e. an interview concerning background information and attitudes of the informant, and an interview concerning language choice. Both interviews were conducted orally. The Interview concerning background and attitudes dealt with factors that were supposed to influence language choice. Questions were asked about the immigration history and the education of the informants and their family, about the composition of the informants' social networks, their attitudes towards the first and second language, their opinions concerning the vitality of both languages, their use of Turkish and Dutch media, consumption of food and listening to music. The informants were also asked to rate their own Dutch language proficiency and that of all family members living in Holland on a five-point scale varying from 'not good at all' to 'very good'.

In the *Interview concerning language choice*, the informants were asked what language register they normally speak with a certain interlocutor at a given setting. For example, they were asked: "What do you speak with your father at home?" The informants could select the most appropriate answer from the following seven-point scale:

1. Only Turkish
2. Almost only Turkish, with a little bit of Dutch
3. More Turkish than Dutch
4. About as much Turkish as Dutch / mixed
5. More Dutch than Turkish
6. Almost only Dutch, with a little bit of Turkish
7. Only Dutch

When an informant indicated, for example, that with the father at home 'almost only Turkish with a little bit of Dutch' was used, Turkish was considered to be the *unmarked language* for communication with this interlocutor in this specific setting (Myers-Scotton, 1993). In that case, the next question would be: "When, or for what reasons, do you switch to Dutch when talking to your father at home?" In other words, the informants were asked for their reasons for switching to the *marked language*. The aim of this kind of question was to let informants self report on determinants of language choice. In addition to the interviews, the informants were asked to participate in two language proficiency tasks. Because the assessment of language proficiency was

merely a sub-goal of the study, which could take up only a limited amount of time, it was decided to restrict the proficiency tasks to the sub-skill of vocabulary. A lexical naming task (Goodglass & Kaplan, 1983; Yagmur, 1997) and a word definition task were developed. The test results, however, are beyond the scope of this paper. The next section will focus on the data concerning the language choice in teenager – adult interaction, which was obtained by means of the *Interview concerning language choice*.

## Results

The potential determinants of language choice, which were obtained by the Interview concerning language choice, can be classified using the framework of Appel and Muysken (1987). Their categorization, which was based on the six functions of the language system as defined by Mühlhäusler (1981), includes the following six categories:
1. Directive factors
2. Referential factors
3. Expressive factors
4. Phatic factors
5. Metalinguistic factors
6. Poetic factors
Each of these categories and their relevant subcategories, will be discussed below and illustrated with interview data.

## Directive factors

The majority of the determinants of language choice which were mentioned by the informants, can be categorized as directive factors. This means that the person to whom the utterance is directed, or other persons present, may determine the language of the utterance. Central concepts in this category are *inclusion* and *exclusion*. In the data, three different instances of inclusion were found. In the first place, informants reported that they used *the dominant language of their interlocutor* to make sure that this person would get the message. The quantitative data support this statement. Table 1 shows the ratings for Dutch language proficiency as they were assigned by the informants to their grandmothers, grandfathers, mothers, fathers, elder sisters, elder brothers and younger siblings respectively. Of the fifty informants, sixteen did actually have a grandmother and fifteen a grandfather who were living in Holland. All informants were living with their mother and father. Furthermore, twenty informants had elder sisters, twenty-six informants had elder brothers, and twenty-nine informants had younger siblings in Holland. To make the data more comparable, only percentages are presented.

The pattern emerging from Table 1 is in accordance with the development that could be expected: the grandparents' proficiency in the majority language is judged to be quite low, while the parents' proficiency is judged to be somewhat higher, and the siblings' proficiency is rated as high, particularly that of elder siblings. It could also be expected that the grandfathers' proficiency in Dutch would be rated slightly higher than that of the grandmothers. After all, these grandfathers were the first Turkish im-

Table1. Ratings for  Dutch language proficiency of family members living in Holland, as they were assigned by the informants, in percentages

| Rating | Grand-mother | Grand-father | Mother | Father | Elder sisters | Elder brothers | Younger siblings |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not good at all | 75.0 | 40.0 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
| Not very good | 25.0 | 33.3 | 42.9 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 |
| Moderate | 0.0 | 20.0 | 22.4 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 |
| Good | 0.0 | 6.7 | 16.3 | 22.0 | 40.0 | 38.5 | 45.0 |
| Very good | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 8.0 | 60.0 | 61.5 | 30.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

migrants who arrived in the Netherlands, while their wives arrived later as a consequence of family reunion. Moreover, most women from that generation were not employed, which provided them with fewer chances to acquire the Dutch language. However, several informants explicitly reported that their grandfather had lost most of his Dutch language skills after retirement. A high degree of variability is found in the ratings of the parents' Dutch language proficiency. This is probably due to the fact that the parents arrived in the Netherlands at different ages, between eight and thirty-five. The observation that the Dutch proficiency of younger siblings is judged to be worse than that of elder siblings, can be explained by the fact that the former group contains children at preschool age. These children, especially those who did not attend a day care centre, can be expected to be dominant in the home language. Table 2 presents the language registers that are used by the fifty informants in conversations with, respectively, their grandmothers, grandfathers, mothers, fathers, elder sisters, elder brothers and younger siblings at home, according to self reports.

From Table 2 it can be observed that a *language shift* over generations is taking place in the Turkish community in the Lombok neighborhood: the grandparents are almost exclusively addressed in Turkish, while Dutch is used extensively with elder

Table 2. Language register spoken with family members living in Holland, as reported by the informant, in percentages.

| Language register | Grand-mother | Grand-father | Mother | Father | Elder sisters | Elder brothers | Younger siblings |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Only Turkish | 87.5 | 71.4 | 32.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| Almost only Turkish | 6.3 | 14.3 | 42.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 7.5 |
| More Turkish than Dutch | 6.3 | 7.1 | 10.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 20.0 |
| About as much Turkish as Dutch/ mixed | 0.0 | 7.1 | 8.0 | 18.0 | 57.9 | 29.2 | 40.0 |
| More Dutch than Turkish | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 26.3 | 20.8 | 17.5 |
| Almost only Dutch | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 2.5 |
| Only Dutch | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 16.7 | 10.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 3. Language register spoken to Turkish adults from the neighborhood respectively in the street and at the informant's home, in absolute numbers and percentages.

| Language register | In the street | | At informant's home | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| Only Turkish | 38 | 77.6 | 38 | 77.6 |
| Almost only Turkish | 7 | 14.3 | 6 | 12.2 |
| More Turkish than Dutch | 2 | 4.1 | 2 | 4.1 |
| About as much Turkish as Dutch / mixed | 1 | 2.0 | 2 | 4.1 |
| More Dutch than Turkish | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
| Almost only Dutch | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Only Dutch | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 49 | 100.0 | 49 | 100.0 |

sisters and brothers. As can be concluded from this table, for communication with the mother as well as with the father, 'almost only Turkish' is the register used by most informants. However, the language registers used with the mothers show a somewhat higher degree of variation. It turned out there is a significant correlation between the language register that is used with the mother, and the rating the informant assigned to her Dutch language proficiency (Pearson's Rho, N=50, alpha = .679, p < .01.). The same goes for the father (Pearson's Rho, N=50, alpha = .644, p < .01). In other words, the higher the informant rates the Dutch language proficiency of the parent, the more Dutch is spoken to this parent. Although the number of informants having grandparents and siblings living in the Netherlands is too small for statistical analysis, it can be assumed that a similar correlation between language dominance and language register exists as well in conversations with these other family members. This could be a plausible explanation for the very small amount of Dutch spoken to the informants' grandparents. However, the grandparents' limited proficiency in Dutch might not be the only reason why they are mainly addressed in Turkish. According to several informants, talking Dutch to elder Turkish people may be interpreted as showing a lack of respect. An eighteen-year-old girl states it like this: *I greet elderly people only in Turkish, that makes a more polite impression*. When the interviewer asks her what would happen if she spoke Dutch to elderly people, she answers: *They would understand it in Dutch*. And a twelve-year-old boy, who is asked in which cases he speaks Dutch to Turkish adults he knows in his neighborhood, gives the following answer: *Only when they say something in Dutch... when a question is asked. In other cases, talking Dutch is like you are ridiculing them*. A fourteen-year-old boy answers the same question: *When you would speak Dutch to them, they would understand, but Turkish is better for them*. And another fourteen-year-old boy adds to this: *When I speak Dutch to them, they would be able to speak Dutch as well, but that never happens to me*. Because it appears from these data that Turkish is considered to be the more appropriate language to speak to elder persons despite the fact that they could have the same conversation in Dutch, it was decided to include the wish to *show social distance/respect* as a directive factor in determining language choice.

Table 4. Language register used with Turkish interlocutors while visiting a Dutch shop, in absolute numbers and percentages.

| Language register | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Only Turkish | 9 | 18.0 |
| Almost only Turkish | 4 | 8.0 |
| More Turkish than Dutch | 3 | 6.0 |
| About as much Turkish as Dutch / mixed | 16 | 32.0 |
| More Dutch than Turkish | 4 | 8.0 |
| Almost only Dutch | 5 | 10.0 |
| Only Dutch | 9 | 18.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 |

This may also be an important explanatory factor for Turkish to be spoken so often to Turkish adults from the neighborhood, either in the street or during a visit to the informant's home, as shown in Table 3. Of the fifty informants, forty-nine actually had adult Turkish acquaintances living in their neighborhood.

Of course it is not possible to determine in daily life situations whether Turkish is spoken to an adult because this is the person's dominant language, or because the younger person wishes to leave a polite impression: in many cases, both factors will interact.

Speaking the dominant language of the interlocutor is the first of three types of inclusion by language choice that was found in the data. The second type is the use of the dominant (or only known) language of *bystanders*, i.e. the bilingual wants to include one or more persons who are not direct participants in the same conversation, but who are located within hearing distance from the bilingual and his or direct interlocutors. For example a thirteen-year-old girl answers the question: *In what way do you speak with other Turkish people when you are visiting a Dutch shop?* in the following way: *I speak only Dutch. I think it is really very impolite when you are standing next to Dutch people, to use a language which they do not understand.* And a fourteen-year-old boy gives the following reason for talking Dutch only in a Dutch shop: *Otherwise, others will get the feeling you are talking about them.* Not all informants share this view, as will be shown under the heading of 'exclusion'. Another thirteen-year-old girl even takes the opposite view in answering the same question: *I speak only Turkish. Just like at school there are more Dutch people there* [= in a Dutch shop], *but since you belong to the Turkish culture, it would be rude if you speak Dutch then.* So the data concerning the language register used in conversation with Turkish interlocutors while visiting a Dutch shop, do show a high degree of variation, as can be seen in Table 4.

The third and last type of inclusion that was found in the data, was *translating and explaining* what had been said, to help someone in the room who is not able to understand fully the main conversation. For example, a thirteen-year-old boy says he talks Turkish to Turkish persons when visiting a Dutch shop, in order to translate for them what has been said by the shop assistant. Besides the three types of *inclusion* de-

Table 5. Language register spoken with father and mother respectively during holidays in Turkey, in absolute numbers and percentages.

| Language register | Mother | | Father | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| Only Turkish | 27 | 54.0 | 17 | 34.0 |
| Almost only Turkish | 17 | 34.0 | 20 | 40.0 |
| More Turkish than Dutch | 2 | 4.0 | 7 | 14.0 |
| About as much Turkish as Dutch / mixed | 2 | 4.0 | 4 | 8.0 |
| More Dutch than Turkish | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
| Almost only Dutch | 1 | 2.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
| Only Dutch | 1 | 2.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 | 50 | 100.0 |

scribed above, three different types of exclusion were found. The most common instance of a particular language choice with the aim to exclude certain persons, is to talk the non-dominant or unknown language of bystanders for *keeping secrets*. For example, Dutch is used to speak with siblings in order to exclude parents who are dominant in Turkish. A fifteen-year-old girl reports she speaks more Dutch than Turkish with her elder brothers at home. She says she uses Dutch: *Simply when my father is not supposed to know something.* However, such a 'secret language' is also used among teenagers and their parents, as appears from the following quotations, concerning the language register spoken with the father during holidays in Turkey. A fourteen-year-old boy says: *I speak almost only Turkish., but I am using Dutch when I am angry, so that my grandfather and mother won't hear it.* And a nineteen-year-old girl, who reports that she uses almost only Turkish with her father in Turkey, says: *I use Dutch when we have visitors, or when they are cheating on you in a shop, then we will say* [in Dutch]: *Come on, do not buy it.* And a thirteen-year-old girl says she uses Dutch in the following situation: *When I have to ask something that other people are not supposed to know, that is just important to me.* A seventeen years old boys says the following about language use with his mother during holidays in Turkey: *Others do get angry sometimes when we talk in Dutch, but we do so about things that are not of others' concern at all.* A sixteen-year-old girl reports use of Dutch in this situation *When I have to say something that others are not supposed to hear. Then she* [=the mother] *will answer me in Turkish.* A fourteen-year-old girl says she uses Dutch with her mother in Turkey: *Just sneaky.* Although it appears that Dutch is used in conversation with the father and the mother in Turkey, a comparison of the percentages in Table 2 and Table 5 shows, that Turkish is spoken with the parents much more frequently in Turkey than in the Netherlands.

A second type of exclusion by means of language choice, is *rebellion against an adult*. When the teenager wishes to react against a parent, he or she will be inclined to do so in the majority language instead of the home language. In the accommodation theory of Giles (1973), this phenomenon is called *divergence*. An example from the data is the following quotation from a sixteen-year-old girl, who tells in what cases

Table 6. Language register spoken with the Turkish language teacher in the classroom and outside the classroom respectively, in absolute numbers and percentages.

| Language register | Inside classroom | | Outside classroom | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| Only Turkish | 38 | 76.0 | 31 | 62.0 |
| Almost only Turkish | 6 | 12.0 | 4 | 8.0 |
| More Turkish than Dutch | 1 | 2.0 | 3 | 6.0 |
| About as much Turkish as Dutch / mixed | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.0 |
| More Dutch than Turkish | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
| Almost only Dutch | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 4.0 |
| Only Dutch | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
| missing | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 2.0 |
| Total | 45 | 100.0 | 45 | 100.0 |

she is talking Dutch to her father: *When the talk is about school. Then my father supposes something, and I will say* [in Dutch]: *No, it is not like that.* When she was asked in what cases she would speak Dutch to her mother, this same girl answered: *When my mother tells me that I cannot wear particular clothes on some occasion, then I say* [in Dutch]: *What business is it of yours?* Rebelling against an adult by means of language choice is not only found in parent – child relations, as appears from the following example. A thirteen-year-old girl reports that she used to speak nothing but Dutch to her former Turkish language teacher when she met him outside the lessons, for example in the schoolyard. She adds: *He could not speak Dutch very well, he asked me what my words meant. For him it was easier to speak Turkish but I did not want that.* When the interviewer inquired how this girl liked the Turkish language lessons, she said she did not like them at all. There is a striking difference between the language use with the Turkish language teacher during lessons and outside the classroom, as can be observed from Table 6. Of the fifty informants, fourty-five actually attended instruction in the Turkish language at the moment of the interview or sometime in the past. One informant could not recall what language she used to speak to her Turkish teacher outside the classroom, while she stopped attending Turkish lessons long ago.

However, it cannot be concluded from these data that many children dislike the Turkish lessons; on the contrary, several informants reported they looked forward to them every week. It should be realized that in an educational setting, language choice is often not free. Many teachers of Turkish require their pupils to only speak Turkish in their lesson, while it is often not allowed to speak Turkish in other lessons in the curriculum. The *authority* of a teacher dictating which language to speak, can be considered to be another determinant of language choice. This determinant also plays an important role in a setting outside the school, that is, in the mosque. A fourteen-year-old boy explains why he always talks Turkish in the mosque by saying: *The Hoca* [=Koran teacher] *tells us to.* And a sixteen-year-old boy says this about the occasions when he used Dutch in the mosque: *We said such things with each other: "Shall we do this today?" When the teacher looked in our direction, we said: "Ssht", and then we*

Table 7. Language register used with Turkish interlocutors while visiting a mosque, in absolute numbers and percentages.

| Language register | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Only Turkish | 37 | 74.0 |
| Almost only Turkish | 3 | 6.0 |
| More Turkish than Dutch | 2 | 4.0 |
| About as much Turkish as Dutch / mixed | 0 | 0.0 |
| More Dutch than Turkish | 0 | 0.0 |
| Almost only Dutch | 0 | 0.0 |
| Only Dutch | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 42 | 100.0 |

*started talking Turkish again*. Table 7 represents the language registers that are used in the mosque by the fourty-two informants who reported they were actually visiting a mosque or had been doing so in the past.

The reason to exclude a person from conversation by means of language choice, does not always have to do with negative feelings against that person, as is the case with rebellion against an adult. The third type of exclusion, is exclusion because of *politeness*. A first instance of this kind of exclusion was found by Verhoeven (1999), who studied language choice in a Turkish family living in Tilburg, the Netherlands. She noticed that her informants talked in Turkish about food and drinks they were going to offer their guest who was dominant in Dutch. Apparently they thought they would disturb their guest less by discussing such a topic in the guest's non-dominant language. A comparable example is given by a sixteen-year-old girl in the current study, who tells in what cases she talks Dutch to her parents while she is on holiday in Turkey: *When I am making coffee, I ask* [in Dutch]: *Where is the sugar?*

Two additional directive factors determining language choice were noted in the data. In the first place, informants reported they would sometimes opt for speaking a particular language to *practise the interlocutor's language skills*. An example of this is given by a seventeen-year-old girl, who tells about her language use with her mother at home: *I speak Dutch most of the time, because my mother has a lot to learn, she is working outside the home.*

Finally, informants report *accommodation to the preceding turn* of the interlocutor, by talking the same language. A thirteen-year-old boy, who reports he is talking about as much Turkish as Dutch to his elder brothers at home, puts it like this: *When they talk Dutch to me, I just talk back like that.*

**Referential factors**

The topic of conversation can also determine language choice. Two subcategories of referential factors were found, i.e. associative factors and lexical factors. In the case where association determines language choice, a certain topic is associated more with either the Turkish or Dutch language and culture by the speaker. For example, a thirteen-year-old girl tells about her conversations with friends in the

street: *We talk Dutch about school, about the teachers. We talk Turkish for example about a Turkish wedding party*. A sixteen-year-old boy, who reports that he uses more Dutch than Turkish with Turkish classmates during the lessons, says he talks Turkish when discussing such topics as *What was on television, or what a Turkish* [political] *party has done*. A twelve-year-old boy reports he uses Dutch with Turkish adults from the neighborhood at home when talking *About how their little son or daughter is doing at school*.

When *lexical factors* determine language choice, the bilingual can switch to language B because of a *word finding problem* in language A. Bilinguals are very conscious of this type of codeswitching, as can be concluded from the fact it is the most often reported determinant of language choice. Some examples from the data are given below.

A sixteen-year-old boy reports he uses almost only Turkish when talking to his father at home. He uses Dutch: *When I do not know a word for a moment*. A sixteen-year-old girl reports she speaks about as much Turkish as Dutch during her holiday in Turkey. *My aunt gets angry when we talk Dutch. She says: "Talk in your own language". And then I say: "We are not talking about you, but it is harder for us to say it in Turkish"*. A thirteen-year-old boy says he used to talk almost only Turkish to his Turkish language teacher outside the lessons. But he talked Dutch: *When I did not know a word*.

It is also possible that a bilingual makes a codeswitch to language B not because a certain word is not known in language A, but because its equivalent in language B is thought to be more *appropriate*. For example, the Turkish word 'abla' is used to call an elder sister, since it is not common to address a person directly with its Dutch equivalent 'zus'.

Sometimes it is not possible to determine whether a certain item is chosen from a particular language because of word finding problems in language A, or because the label in language B is thought to be more appropriate. For example, a twelve-year-old boy tells about his language choice in a Turkish shop in Lombok: *I speak Turkish when I buy Turkish goods. I speak Dutch when there are Dutch goods in the Turkish shop; in that case the whole sentence becomes Dutch*. In this quotation the informant also shows his awareness that a problem to find a single word can trigger a new language for several consequent sentences.

**Expressive factors**

The bilingual use two languages can alternately in order to *emphasize his or her mixed identity*. This is especially done by teenagers in ingroup conversations. Boeschoten and Backus (1997) even claim that this kind of in-group speech can be considered as a language variety on its own, in which it is impossible to determine for what reasons a certain word is picked from language A and the next word from language B. From the present data it appears that teenagers wish to display their mixed identity not only to each other, but also to others. A fourteen-year-old boy reports he talks almost only in Turkish to his Turkish friends during all school lessons, although his teachers do not allow this. When he is asked why he does so, he answers: *Because*

*I am a Turk*. Interviewer: *And do you want to show others that you are?* Informant: *Yes, I think so*. A twelve-year-old boy reports he speaks only Dutch to his elder brothers during holidays in Turkey. *I want to make it known: I am from Holland. Yes, I am proud of that*. The same informant also reports he speaks only Turkish in Turkish shops in the Netherlands. *Because when I am there I want to make clear that I am Turkish. So I speak Turkish, for example, to my little brothers*.

**Phatic factors**

The discourse functions of codeswitching formulated by Gumperz (1982) can be classified in this category. To emphasize that a certain language act is performed, the bilingual can switch to another language. The discourse functions mentioned by Gumperz are quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, message qualification and personalization versus objectivization. Besides quotation, informants from this study also mentioned negotiation, nagging, joking and reprimanding. An example of negotiation is given by a thirteen-year-old boy, who reports speaking more Turkish than Dutch while talking to his mother at home. *I use Dutch when I want to ask for something, for example whether I can go outside with friends, it is easier*. An example of nagging is given by a thirteen-year-old girl, who says she speaks almost only in Turkish with her mother at home. *I use Dutch for sweet-talk, for example: "Can I have some money?"* However, it might be the case that in both examples a switch in Dutch is made not only to emphasize a language act, but also because using Dutch, which is the non-dominant language of the parents, is less direct and for that reason a more polite way to ask for a favour. In that case the example could also be classified under the heading of directive factors.

Besides language acts, strong *emotions* can also trigger a certain language. For example, a fourteen-year-old girl says: *I talk Turkish to my younger cousins when I am angry with them*.

**Metalinguistic factors**

Language can also be used to talk consciously *about language*. According to the informants, this can be done to ask for a word's meaning, to answer someone's questions about language, or to correct someone's utterance. An example of the last mentioned case is given by a twelve-year-old boy, who claims he speaks almost only Turkish when visiting his aunts and uncles. *I speak Dutch when someone tries to say a sentence in Dutch, so then I will show them what mistakes they make*. From the following quotations it appears that linguistic help is sometimes asked by the adults of their children, and sometimes the other way around. A thirteen-year-old boy who reports he talks almost only in Turkish with his father at home, says: *We talk Dutch when we are watching a Dutch television program, and he wants to know what it means. Then I will usually give an explanation in Dutch*. A thirteen-year-old girl who reports she speaks about as much Turkish as Dutch to her father at home, says: *I speak Dutch when I see something in the* [television] *news, and then I will ask in Turkish what it means*.

**Poetic factors**

In conclusion, both languages can be used for *word play*. When a piece of discourse, for example, an anecdote about the well known Turkish character Nasreddin Hoca, is passed on to others in the language in which it was originally heard, this is called *intertextuality*. Poetic factors are reported least frequently. An example is given by a fifteen-year-old boy, who reports using more Dutch than Turkish with Turkish friends during school lessons. However, Turkish is used: *For personal things, and for jokes.*

**Conclusion**

In summary, the interviews concerning language choice which were conducted with fifty bilingual teenagers from Lombok/Transvaal, yielded the following categories of factors which may determine language choice:
1. Directive factors
   Inclusion
   – Use of (dominant) language of interlocutor
   – Use of (dominant) language of bystanders
   – Translating and explaining a conversation Exclusion
   – Secrets
   – Rebellion against an adult
   – Politeness
   Practising the interlocutor's language skills
   Respect/ social distance
   Authority
   Accommodation to preceding turn
2. Referential factors
   Association
   Lexical
   – Appropriateness
   – Word finding problems
3. Expressive factors
4. Phatic factors
   Language acts
   Emotions
5. Metalinguistic factors
6. Poetic factors
   Word play
   Intertextuality

In everyday conversation factors can sometimes interact, as shown in the example of a girl nagging her mother for some money in Dutch, which could be classified under the heading of directive factors as well as under the heading of phatic factors. Because the taxonomy presented above totally relies on reported data, it will be tested against and elaborated on the basis of observed data which will be gathered in the continuation of the project. Conversations from a small group of informants, who

differ in their relative use of the various language registers, will be recorded in several settings, such as the home, schools, shops and community centres. The data to be gathered in this way will be used to shed a clearer light on the compelling phenomena of codeswitching and language choice.

## References

Aarssen & Jongenburger. (2000). *Talen en Culturen in het Utrechtse Lombok/Transvaal: een survey studie*. Amsterdam: Spinhuis.

Appel, R. & P. Muysken. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

Backus, A. (1996). *Two in one: bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands. Studies in multilingualism*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Blom, J.P. & J.J. Gumperz. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: code-switching in Norway. In J.J. Gumperz & D.H. Hymes (Eds), *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication* (pp. 407-434). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Boeschoten, H. & A. Backus. (1997). Codeswitching and ongoing linguistic change. *Turkic languages*, 1, 41-62.

Fishman, J. (1971). *Sociolinguistics. A brief introduction*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Giles, H. (1973) Towards a theory of interpersonal accommodation through language: some Canadian data. *Language in society* 2, 177-92.

Goodglass, H. & E. Kaplan. (1983). *The assessment of aphasia and related disorders* (second edition). Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.

Li Wei. (1994). *Three generations, two languages, one family. Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mühlhäusler, P. (1981). Structural expansion and the process of creolization. In A. Valdman & A. Highfield (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in pidgin and creole studies*. New York.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Van Avermaet, P. & J. Klatter-Folmer. (1997). De relatie tussen taalkeuze, inschatting taalvaardigheid Nederlands en sociaal-culturele factoren bij Italianen in Vlaanderen en Turken in Nederland. *Toegepaste taalwetenschap in artikelen*, 57, 93-103.

Van Steensel, R. (2000). Praten zonder stokjes. Een onderzoek naar intra-etnische taalkeuze binnen Chinese gezinnen in Nederland. MA thesis. Tilburg: Tilburg University.

Verhoeven, E. (1999). Ik zeg gewoon wat ze wel snappen. Een exploratief onderzoek naar taalkeuze binnen een Turks gezin in Nederland. MA thesis. Tilburg: Tilburg University.

Yagmur, K. (1997). *First language attrition among Turkish speakers in Sydney. Studies in multilingualism*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.