Psychology of Language and Communication 2002, Vol. 6, No. 1

AD BACKUS
HANNEKE VAN DER HEIJDEN
Tilburg University

LANGUAGE MIXING BY YOUNG TURKISH CHILDREN IN THE NETHERLANDS

This study addresses the question whether children growing up in the bilingual Turkish immigrant community in the Netherlands acquire a mixed vernacular or two separate languages between which they frequently codeswitch. This is done through a comparison of the codeswitching patterns found in child and adult data. It turns out that there are more similarities than differences. That leads to the conclusion that the children learn to mix their languages in a way that matches the input they receive. Unlike what has been shown to be the case for children who are brought up with the «one-parent-one-language» strategy, codeswitching does not disappear from the speech of these children as they grow older and learn to adapt to the language choice patterns current in the community. Still, the mixed speech cannot be described as a lect in itself, as there is great variability between informants as to when and where to switch. In addition, most of the codeswitching is of the alternational type, which does not lend itself well to the norm-establishing process of focusing.

Introduction

Studies of language mixing by little children tend to focus on children growing up in middle-class families in which the parents speak separate languages to the child. Papers on language acquisition in contexts where parents habitually codeswitch are much rarer. Yet, a huge number of children all over the world grow up with exactly that kind of input. This study describes one of these cases.

In recent years, an increasing number of studies have appeared in which codeswitching (CS) is portrayed as a bilingual community's natural way of speaking, as its basic vernacular. Speakers seem to be largely unaware of how much and what kinds of CS they produce, and for the analyst it is difficult to assign clear communicative or other functions to every individual switch. Rather, the whole pattern of language alternation seems to function as an unmarked choice. This, in turn, sug-

Address for correspondence: Ad Backus, UCSD, Linguistics Department 0108, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92092-0108, USA. E-mail addresses: a.m.backus@kub.nl or backus@ling.ucsd.edu

gests that a pattern has some internal consistency as a language, since how else could someone choose to speak it? In that case, the pattern of alternation may be more adequately labeled a mixed lect, which exists side-by-side with monolingual registers or varieties of the two languages that make up the mixture.

It stands to reason that children who grow up in such a community acquire this way of speaking as their primary language. This would be in stark contrast with the children who are normally described in studies of bilingual language acquisition, children who are growing up in families in which the father and the mother each speak different languages. In such cases, the children are taught not to codeswitch. What they have to learn is to separate their languages and use the right language with the right person. Quite surprisingly, studies of such bilingual children are widely accepted as part of the canon of CS studies, yet the considerable differences between their individual language choice patterns and the conventionalized CS patterns of adults in bilingual communities, has rarely been the subject of investigation. This article is an attempt to address this issue, in that it focuses on children who are growing up in a truly bilingual community.

Children's codeswitching

We will use the term codeswitching as a cover term, for every case in which material that originates in two different languages is juxtaposed within the same clause or speech exchange. This definition includes both insertional (also known as intrasentential), and alternational switching (which subsumes what used to be called extra- and intersentential CS). This definition does not distinguish between cases which are functionally (i.e. situationally or stylistically) motivated and cases which are not. Generally, alternational CS fulfils certain pragmatic or communicative functions more often than insertional CS, but functionality is essentially an independent level of description, relevant for all structural types. Many studies have appeared in the past three decades, covering a host of language pairs and sociolinguistic settings. In the 1990's, this has increasingly led to the building of models for CS. Attempts to explain insertional and alternational CS tend to be kept separate; the former are mainly developed from a syntactic perspective (e.g. Myers-Scotton, 1997; Halmari, 1997; Johanson, 1993), the latter from a pragmatic one (e.g. Myers-Scotton, 1993; Auer, 1998).

In the following, a brief overview of codeswitching research will be given, focusing on the development of mixed lects and on codeswitching by children.

Acquiring a mixed lect

In the following, we will ignore models of child bilingualism which do not concern themselves with mixed speech as part of a community's linguistic repertoire. The children we are concerned with grow up with what we call a mixed lect as part of the input. That is, CS is implicitly encouraged in these cases, while it was discouraged in most of the cases of children's CS reported in the literature, cases in which parents followed the 'one-parent-one-language' strategy.

The existence of a mixed lect is not easy to demonstrate. The reason for this is that it must necessarily consist of many structures that look like CS at first sight, but that are not CS in the literal sense of the word, because they don't fulfil any obvious communicative function. A taxonomy of various kinds of communicative functions of CS has been established, and they have all been documented in the speech of children as well (McClure, 1981), though rarely in children as young as our informants. It is not very fruitful to talk of a mixed lect in such cases, as what is happening seems to be better grasped by a description in terms of language choices. However, it has also become clear, from the study of corpuses of bilingual speech, that not every instance of CS has a clear communicative function. Though we should bear in mind that researchers differ in the extent to which they are prepared to assign a specific meaning to every instance of codeswitching' (Romaine, 1991: 161), it is widely accepted now that CS itself, as a speech mode, may serve a function. To talk about speech modes is equivalent to saying that CS is part of a conventionalized bilingual lect, a mixed language, if you will.

There are two theoretical frameworks in which this view is accommodated, Myers-Scotton's (1993) markedness model and Auer (1998)'s model of fusion. Myers-Scotton sees frequent insertional CS as indicative of a speech mode in which CS is the unmarked way of speaking in informal conversations. Though there is quite a bit of support for this, some researchers do clearly find functional separation of the languages in the speech of bilingual children (e.g. Halmari & Smith, 1994). The split between these two situations seems to coincide with the division alluded to above, between informants who come from bilingual communities and those who come from individual families in which two languages happen to be spoken. Only in the former case, development of a new mixed or fused register seems possible, since in the latter there are no community-wide norms that would stimulate such a development.

The main issue in which discussions of the *structural* aspects of insertional CS touch on our topic here is that of the demarcation between CS and borrowing. This is largely a theoretical issue. If two languages, A and B, come into contact, and bilingual speakers alternately speak A and B, then we can say there is language alternation (of the type called alternational CS) between two monolingual varieties. However, as soon as A borrows a word from B, it has made its first step towards a bilingual register, a mixed lect. Obviously, we won't call it a mixed lect until it has borrowed a large number of words from B, and preferably also some structural and semantic features but, theoretically, the case for a mixed lect is clear. However, this relies entirely on having an unambiguous way of deciding whether that B word in an A clause has been borrowed by A or not, i.e. whether it has become part of the A lexicon. This unambiguous way, unfortunately, doesn't exist. There is something to be said for turning the burden of proof over to the other side: any B word in an A clause is considered a borrowing, unless it is clear that it is a codeswitch. For instance, if the switch is flagged with discourse markers, such as "what do you call it?" or "as we say in B", then it is likely that the speaker intended it as a CS. We will adopt this liberal definition of borrowing, making it almost identical with insertional CS which, as we said above, is used here as a cover term.

In this article, we will explore the idea that Turkish children in Holland are acquiring a variety of Turkish in which CS to Dutch is conventionalized, so that a mixed mode of speech has entered the linguistic repertoire of the immigrant community that should be seen as a register of Turkish.

Previous studies of bilingual children

Most case studies of bilingual children concern children of individual immigrant families who are not part of a larger bilingual immigrant community and who are brought up with the 'one-parent-one-language' strategy. Examples include de Houwer (1990), Petersen (1988), Meisel (1990), Schlyter (1987), and Lanza (1993). As we indicated in the introduction, these studies are not of direct relevance to us here, as we are primarily interested in the development of a mixed lect in a bilingual community, something which obviously won't happen in these families characterized by what could be called a double monolingual habitus (see Vihman, 1998: 52). Still, a few findings should be mentioned here.

Lanza's (1993: 207) Norwegian-English informant 'could differentiate her language use over time according to situational demands'. Meisel (1990) maintains that this is only determined by the practice the child gets in speaking two languages and that it is unrelated to linguistic development. He found that CS first occurred around the age of two, though at that time it was still restricted both functionally (lexical relief strategy) and structurally (little complex intrasentential CS up to age 3;0). In Schlyter's data, mixing decreased in such a way that as soon as the child started to acquire language-specific grammatical patterns, he/she also separated the languages lexically. It is suggested that, without monolingual interactions and/or parental linguistic strategies, this separation will not, or not easily, take place.

There have been a few studies of CS by children who did grow up in an environment where extensive mixing was actually present in the input. While the 'one-parent-one-language' strategy is typical for individual immigrant or expatriate families that are not part of a larger immigrant community, it is more or less non-existent in bilingual communities. These, of course, are the communities where mixed lects tend to develop, usually as a register of the ancestral language, and usually co-existing with a monolingual register of that language.

First of all, these studies, too, show children's sensitivity to the importance of language choice. McClure (1981) studied Mexican American children in the age range from 3 to 15. Among the factors influencing situational CS she found participants to be primary. Children were aware from an early age onwards of the fact that different interlocutors may require different language choices. This was corroborated by Moffatt & Milroy (1992) for Punjabi children in Britain. Language choices are made according to the language proficiency, the language preference and the social identity of the interlocutor. Efforts like ours must take this into account. There is no indication that these children choose a crystallized mixed lect always and everywhere. Particularly damaging for a hypothesis in that direction is that some fluent bilinguals simply don't codeswitch at all. On the other hand, the children in McClure's study used a more mixed register in informal situations, set off against more monolingual Spanish in

more formal situations. That shows some sensitivity to the role of a mixed register in the community's linguistic repertoire.

As the children grew older, they shifted from predominantly insertional to predominantly alternational styles of CS. As we will see, this shift characterizes immigrant communities in general.

Moffatt & Milroy (1992), in their study of CS by 3-5 year old Punjabi immigrant children living in Great Britain, drew attention to the differences between CS in the two directions. The use of Punjabi elements in English-based sentences always occurred when addressing English monolinguals, especially during story-telling. This pattern was considered to be motivated by lexical gap filling and was expected to disappear with ongoing acquisition of English. For Punjabi-based intrasentential CS, on the other hand, a different development was expected. This type was always directed to (bilingual) speakers of Punjabi and is thus taken to reflect the mixed code of the Punjabi community in Great Britain, which is also present in the children's language input. Hence, Moffatt & Milroy (1992: 367) hypothesize that this type of CS will not disappear with age. They further found that alternational types of CS were much more frequent than insertion. As a whole, the amount of CS used is said to vary considerably among the informants; this fits well with McClure's (1981) findings. Supporting evidence for the acquisition of a mixed code by Punjabi children in Britain comes from Agnihotri (1979); for a similar point, cf. Bentahila & Davies (1994).

Pfaff (1999) also supports this picture. In her study of 1-8 year-old Turkish children attending a bilingual day care centre in Berlin, she found that the 'German-mode', with initial Turkish insertions, rapidly evolved into a monolingual mode, whereas the 'Turkish-mode', consisting of Turkish as a base language with German insertions, increasingly approximated community norms, which allows for numerous switches into German.

As for Turkish children in Holland, Boeschoten & Verhoeven (1987), who cross-sectionally studied CS among 4-7 year-old children, found evidence for some communicatively motivated (i.e. stylistic) CS (including the use of Dutch discourse markers in Turkish speech), but concluded that CS was mainly insertional and mainly to fill lexical gaps, i.e. items that are untranslatable, have not been acquired yet or are less available. Most Dutch insertions were single nouns, and, to a lesser degree, adjectives and verbs. These results, as well as the incorporation patterns used to embed these words in Turkish clauses, are all typical of insertional CS in general (cf. Backus, 1992, for extensive comparable data on CS by young adults).

In the Turkish community in the Netherlands, some structural variation in the CS patterns of adults has been documented (Backus, 1996), mainly along generational lines. Generations differ in their respective proficiencies in Turkish and Dutch, which may have led to the differences in CS patterns. Nevertheless, some patterns have been a constant aspect of immigrant speech ever since immigration began, perhaps due to conventionalization, perhaps to universals of language contact, or perhaps to both. The mixed lect of one generation will be part of the input for later generations, especially if the mixed lect is the main informal vernacular. Thus, Turks from the second and following generations are confronted with what Johanson (1993) calls a

'double channel', both for the input of Dutch and of Turkish. Input of Dutch is offered directly in contacts with monolingual speakers of Dutch and indirectly via conventionalized use of Dutch in the speech of bilingual Turks (including fossilizations). In the same way, input of Turkish is offered through contacts with monolingual speakers of Turkish (there still is a steady influx of migrants from Turkey to the Netherlands) and through interactions with bilingual Turks.

This paper presents a comparison of adult's and children's CS. Our main perspective is comparative: we wish to find out whether children acquiring Turkish in the immigrant setting exhibit the same CS patterns as adults do. If so, that could suggest that they are acquiring the variety, complete with CS, that their parents teach them, or it could suggest that universals of language contact bring about the same results in children and adults. If they don't, acquisition apparently sets its own patterns of bilingual combination. These issues will be taken up in Section 5.

Therefore, our basic question is how much of children's CS can be explained by community norms and how much by degrees of bilingual proficiency (for useful studies on the influence of proficiency on CS patterns, cf. Poplack, 1980; Berk-Seligson, 1986; Nortier, 1990; Bentahila & Davies, 1991; Singh & Backus; 2000). The available evidence seems to indicate that all bilingual children do some CS and that they learn more rapidly to keep the languages separate if they are brought up to do so (the 'one-parent-one-language'-children). Children who grow up in a community that has a mixed lect as its vernacular eventually also learn to keep the languages separate, but will continue to use the mixed lect in the appropriate circumstances, i.e. in informal in-group conversations[1].

Methodology

Four informants were followed in their linguistic development of both Turkish and Dutch in the age range of 2;0 to 3;6 years. At the outset, we should mention that we don't have access to one kind of data that could be considered crucial for our enterprise: data on the input the children in our study received from their parents. All we have is data from other young adults in the immigrant community.

Another methodological hurdle is that the children were recorded in Dutch and Turkish settings, in each case with a monolingual researcher. This was because the research project was mainly interested in the acquisition of the two languages in a bilingual setting. That the children codeswitched extensively, was in itself a salient finding and, in a way, a complete surprise. For extensive discussion of the design of the study, see Van der Heijden & Verhoeven (1994: 54-56).

Instances of CS were collected from all core transcripts of the four bilingual core informants. Two major types were distinguished: *alternation* and *insertion*. Unclear cases were removed from the analysis. Although Turkish and Dutch words are in general not very much alike in phonological respects, it is often difficult to decide whether a word used by the informants is Turkish or Dutch, due to the fact that the

[1] Studying children in the first condition can function as a quasi-experimental setting for studying the influence of degrees of proficiency, as community norms are completely absent in their input.

children are still in the process of acquiring the sound systems of both languages. Cognates were excluded, as were cases where the codeswitch was a literal repetition of an earlier utterance, and cases where the switch consisted of the use of a proper noun or a term of address for one of the parents.

As a first step, of all utterances containing an intrasentential switch, the base language[2] was determined. The base language is defined as the language providing the utterance's predicate. Thus, if the verbal predicate, or at least the morphemes denoting person and/or tense are realized in Turkish, the utterance is taken to be Turkish, which may have Dutch material incorporated in it. However, sometimes no verbal predicate is explicitly expressed in the utterance; in those cases, the base language is taken to be the language providing the function words. The base language of the utterance *deze ekmek* (this-Dutch + bread-Turkish) 'this (one is) bread', is, therefore, regarded to be Dutch, based on the language of the determiner. Alternational switches were defined as those language switches which occurred at the boundary of a clause, including switches at turn boundaries. Participant-related switches coinciding with a change in addressee, however, were not included, as they tend to follow fixed language choice patterns, for example because the addressee is known to be monolingual. Considerable difficulty in extracting such switches from our recordings of spontaneous conversations is due to the fact that it is often hard to infer the addressee of an utterance. In the coding of alternational switches the following four factors were taken into account: type (within a speech turn or between turns), direction of switching (Turkish → Dutch or Dutch → Turkish), addressee, and length of the switch. All utterances and sequences containing a switch according to the criteria mentioned above were extracted from the transcripts and registered in separate lists.

Results

In addition to a focus on structure and direction of CS, the phenomenon of children's CS will also be described from a developmental point of view. To save space, no comprehensive overview of adult Turkish-Dutch CS will be given; instead, we will indicate which findings regarding the children's CS are similar to the adult data and which ones are different. For more complete overviews of adult CS in this community cf. Backus (1996) and Backus (1999).

Overview

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of insertional and alternational codeswitches in the recordings of the four Turkish informants. The total amount of codeswitches per informant is set at 100% for each direction of switching.

From Table 1 it is clear that, for all informants, alternation is the more frequently used type. As for the direction of insertional switching, Dutch elements are inserted

---

[2] We are using this term, rather than „Matrix Language", since our working definition is slightly different from what Myers-Scotton (1997) defines the Matrix Language to be. In actual practice, however, the two definitions will yield virtually identical results.

Table 1. Distribution of codeswitching types among the informants (age 2;0-3;6), by base language (Turkish or Dutch) for insertion, and by language switched from for alternation; absolute numbers in parentheses.

Base language	Type of CS	Selma	Berrin	Filiz	Ṭükran
Turkish	Insert	8.3	33.0	16.3	11.9
		(3)	(38)	(77)	(40)
	Alter	91.6	67.0	83.7	88.1
		(33)	(77)	(395)	(295)
Dutch	Insert	7.4	2.7	18.7	10.7
		(2)	(6)	(33)	(9)
	Alter	92.6	97.3	81.3	89.3
		(25)	(212)	(144)	(75)

into Turkish; CS the other way round doesn't often occur. Interesting patterns emerge for alternation. Three of the informants show a preference for switching from Dutch to Turkish; Berrin, however, definitely prefers to switch to Dutch. Developmental trends in the use of the different types of CS patterns will be dealt with in the separate sections on each type.

Insertional codeswitching

First, a general overview of switches into Turkish- and Dutch-based utterances will be made, followed by a discussion of a few selected structures.

In Table 2, the distribution is given of insertions per base language. The table confirms the findings of Pfaff (1999) in Berlin. The use of Dutch words in Turkish-based utterances is much more frequent, for all informants, than switches the other way round. In other words, the informants' Dutch is more monolingual than their Turkish. This is also in accordance with the patterns for second generation adults described in Backus (1996). However, despite this general correspondence among the informants, there is considerable variation between them in the frequency with which they use Dutch words, the extreme cases being Selma and Filiz. Quantitative

Table 2. Distribution of base languages for the insertional codeswitches of the four informants, in percentages (absolute numbers in parentheses).

Informant	Turkish	Dutch	Not clear	Total
Selma	60.0	40.0	0	100
	(3)	(2)	(-)	(5)
Berrin	80.9	12.8	6.3	100
	(38)	(6)	(3)	(47)
Filiz	66.4	28.4	5.2	100
	(77)	(33)	(6)	(116)
Ṭükran	78.4	17.7	3.9	100
	(40)	(9)	(2)	(51)

Table3. Distribution of the informants' insertional codeswitches (in absolute numbers) per base language (Turkish or Dutch) and session (I-VII).

Inf	BASE	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	tot.
Selma	Tur	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	3
	Dut	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2
Berrin	Tur	-	3	7	4	7	15	2	38
	Dut	-	1	-	3	1	1	-	6
Filiz	Tur	14	4	17	8	21	12	1	77
	Dut	1	-	5	3	15	7	2	33
Ṭükran	Tur	-	4	-	13	13	7	3	40
	Dut	-	-	-	4	1	3	1	9

variation may have been caused by differences in the amount of data, but individual variation in the frequency of CS is often mentioned in the literature, though there has been little actual empirical investigation (cf. McClure, 1981; Pfaff, 1999; Moffatt & Milroy, 1992; also see Backus, 1996 for adult data).

Table 3 shows that it is dangerous to rely too much on such absolute figures in assessing overall density of CS, as there are considerable differences across sessions.

If we now investigate the structural aspects (see Table 4), again both parallels and differences between the informants come to light. Filiz appears to be not only the most frequent, but also the most varied codeswitcher. For all informants and both directions, most switches consist of single nouns. As for the other categories, however, there is quite a bit of variation across informants.

Most of these switches are morphosyntactically embedded in the base language in the same way as in the adult data. The prototypical Dutch insertion in Turkish speech, familiar from the adult data, is found here as well. Dutch content words, mainly

Table 4. Distribution of insertional codeswitches (in absolute numbers) in the data of the four informants, per base language and word class of the switch.

	Selma		Berrin		Filiz		Ṭükran	
Word class	Tur	Dut	Tur	Dut	Tur	Dut	Tur	Dut
Noun	1	2	24	4	39	24	30	3
Verb	-	-	-	-	4	7	-	-
Pronoun	1	-	5	1	9	-	8	4
Adjective	1	-	-	1	2	1	-	2
Adverb	-	-	6	-	8	1	2	-
Interjection	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Direct speech	-	-	3	-	13	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Total	3	2	38	6	77	33	40	9

nouns, are, where needed, affixed with Turkish inflection for person, number, and case, and occupy the clausal positions Turkish syntax dictates. Some examples of inserted Dutch nouns are given in (1).

(1) a. *senin okulunda **glijbaan** var mý?* s33t,19
"is there a **slide** at your school?"
b. *ţimdi ben **pepernoot** yapýyom* b34t,5
"now I'm making **spice nuts**."
c. *iki tane **aliţ** ver.* f22t,13
"give me two **ice creams**."
d. *o **slaapkamerde** oynadým.* b33n,15
"I played in that **bedroom**."
e. *bunlar **poesjenýn** yemeđi.* b34t,7
"these are the **cat's** food."
f. *içine **puplar** gelecek.* s210t,4
"there will come **dolls** in it."

Dutch nouns appear in many positions, for example as copula complement (1a), as indefinite direct object (1b), preceded by a numerical modifier (1c), as the complement of a locative (1d), as the possessor in a genitive phrase (1e), or as the subject (1f).

They follow Turkish syntactic rules in subtle ways, not just in their placement in the clause. In (1c), the Dutch noun is singular, even though the meaning conveyed is plural. This is in line with the Turkish rule which excludes plural markers in combination with numerals and quantifiers (while such a marker would be required by Dutch morpho-syntax). Note that the Dutch noun in (1e) is marked with the Turkish plural morpheme, again completely following the rules of Turkish.

Only one example was found of a bare form: the Dutch noun in (2) should have been suffixed with the 2nd person copula form according to Turkish rules.

(2) *sen **jongetje**?* f30n,6
"(are) you (a) **boy**?"

As in all reported cases of CS, inserted Dutch adjectives are virtually always used predicatively, cf. (3a). The most frequently inserted Dutch adverbs are discourse markers, such as zo ja in (3b). These are common in the adult data too, but the use of the Dutch spatial adverbs *hier* 'here' and *daar* '(over) there' in Turkish utterances is exclusively found in child data, cf. (3c).

(3) a. *seninki # **leu::k*** f21n,13
"yours # **nice**."
b. *bak hemen **zo ja** dursun.* b28n,6
"look at once, it should stand **like that yeah**."
c. *kim var **daar**?* f30n,23
"who is **there**?"

Another difference from the adult data is the use of Dutch personal and demonstrative **pronouns** in Turkish clauses. The pronouns come in various forms because Dutch distinguishes between subject and oblique forms, and marks pronouns for gender and number. When inserted into Turkish clauses, these forms are used in accordance with the syntactic function they fulfil in the utterance. However, none of the switched Dutch pronouns is combined with Turkish suffixes, which sometimes results in bare forms. In (4a), either a Turkish dative case marker or a Dutch preposition expressing direction would have been required. Example (4b) is rather remarkable. The Dutch pronoun is realized with the case marker its Turkish equivalent would have required: *in bir ţey var mý baţka senin*, the pronoun bears the genitive case ending. Furthermore, the place of the pronoun in this utterance is exclusively appropriate to Turkish syntax. Pronoun doubling (cf. Jake, 1994) occurs in 5 of the 23 instances of pronoun switching, cf. (4d). We have analyzed these as cases of alternation, however, rather than as insertion.

(4) a. ***mij*** *at he?* b36n,12
"throw (it) (to) **me** alright?"
b. *bir ţey var mý baţka* ***jou(w)****.* f29n,4
"do **you** have anything else?"
c. *alma* ***die****.* s25n, 19
"don't take **that**."
d. *sen ne güzel yapýyon* ***jij****.* s36t,11
"how nice you're doing that **you**."

Use of Dutch **verbs** was rare, in sharp contrast with the adult data. In one case, a Dutch stem was used with Turkish inflection (see 5a). This form was realized at a very young age. The expected pattern, incorporation of Dutch infinitives in a construction with Turkish yap= or et=, reported to be very common in adult Turkish-Dutch, Turkish-German and Turkish-Norwegian CS (cf., e.g., Boeschoten & Verhoeven, 1987; Backus, 1992, 1996; Pfaff, 1999; Türker, 2000), was only found once (see 5b). Though the Dutch verb itself imitates the preceding utterance by the investigator, Filiz embeds it in a Turkish construction. The children do use yap= fairly often with Dutch nouns (Van der Heijden, 1997), which has also been observed for the first generation informants among the adults. Backus & Boeschoten (1996) suggest that this is the construction out of which the combination of Dutch infinitives with *yap*= originates. In any case, *yap*= functions as a full lexical verb in these combinations, cf. (5c).

(5) a. ***kijk****ele.* f22t,2
"**look**!"
b. [researcher:] ***kom je eventjes helpen met opruimen****?*
"**will you come and help me to clear away**?"
[filiz:] *ah* ***opruimen*** *yapam mi?* f28n,23
"ah shall I **clear away** ...?"

c. *simdi ben **pepernoot** yapiyom.* b34t,*5
"now I'm making **spice nuts**."

Incorporation of Dutch verbs by combining them with the Turkish verbs yap= or et= 'to do' was not particularly widespread either in the data reported by Boeschoten & Verhoeven (1987). In Pfaff's data (1999) single nouns sometimes occur in mixed compound verb constructions. These constructions generally consist of a German noun followed by a Turkish inflected auxiliary (e.g. *Geschenk etti* 's/he gave a present'). While Turkish dominant children use both *yap=* and *et=* as an auxiliary, German dominant children overwhelmingly choose *yap=*. Further, one of the German dominant informants often uses a German infinitive form combined with an inflected Turkish auxiliary.

In the limited amount of data we have of the children's language input, Dutch verbs incorporated with *yap=* occur, though relatively infrequently (Van der Heijden, 1997). An example appears in (6a). Here, too, we find quite a few occurrences of this verb with Dutch nouns. As in the reported adult data, these nouns can be anything from concrete to processual. In the latter case, *yap=* contributes little meaning of its own, cf. (6b). Note the different choice of verb used with "big swig" in the two languages: when it's in Dutch, the verb is *yap=*, but when it is in Turkish (*büyük yüdüm*), it is *iç=* ("to drink").

(6) a. filiz,29n! 1525; speaker is Filiz' mother
*hadi **helpen** yap hanneke'ye. ... hadi **helpen** yap.*
"come on, **help** Hanneke ... come on, **help** [her]"
b. selma3,669; speaker is Selma's mother
*içecek misin onu # kaldýrýyým. hadi bir tane **grote slok** yap. bir tane büyük yüdüm iç. **heel groot heel groot. ja goed zo**.*
"can you drink it? I pick it up. Come on, take a **big swig**. Drink a really big swig. **Real big, real big. Yeah, well done**."

Relatively limited proficiency in Dutch seems to be the best way to explain the remarkable similarity between the children and first generation adults, on the one hand, and their equally remarkable differences, on the other. The main similarities and differences will be summarized in Section 5.

Alternational codeswitching

Table 5 shows the extent to which the children used alternational types of CS, separated here into two main categories: Dutch discourse markers (often referred to as "extrasentential CS"), and "real" alternation (roughly identical with "intersentential CS", including CS at turn boundaries).

The use of Dutch discourse markers resembles that of Dutch insertions. All informants more often use Dutch elements in their Turkish than the other way round. This is in complete agreement with the adult data. Filiz again turns out to be the most frequent switcher, whereas Selma uses hardly any Dutch discourse markers.

Various categories of Dutch discourse markers could be distinguished; three will be illustrated here. First, Turkish utterances may be preceded or followed by a Dutch

Table 5. Use of alternational CS by the four informants.

	Discourse Markers		„Real" alternation	
	Dutch	Turkish	to Dutch	to Turkish
Selma	3	2	23	30
Berrin	21	3	209	56
Filiz	66	8	136	329
Ṭükran	15	3	72	280
Total	105	16	440	695

term of negation or affirmation (cf. 7a). This is the most frequently used category, just as in the adult data. Requests for approval form the second most frequent category, illustrated in (7b). Third, Dutch exclamations are used to attract the interlocutor's attention; most of these forms are an imperative form of the verbs *bak*= (Turkish) or *kijk*= (Dutch), both meaning 'to look', cf. (7c).

(7) a. **nee**: *o kapatýr.* s22n,19
"**no**, s/he will close (it)."
b. *onu da sonra götürücez **he**?* f34t,14
"we will take that later on, **won't we**?"
c. **kijk** ald? h34t,7
"**look**, s/he took (it)."

One typical property of Dutch discourse markers in the adult data, which is frequent placement in the middle of the matrix utterance, was not found at all in the child data (Backus & Van der Heijden, 1998: 542). In sum, Dutch discourse markers are used rarely by the children, though their number seems to increase somewhat with the informant's age, which would be in accordance with the view that the children are in the process of acquiring the mixed lect their parents speak.

The prototype of alternational CS is, of course, the intersentential switch. Table 5 makes clear that this type of switching is much more frequent than any other type, another striking similarity to the adult second generation data. Contrary to the picture that emerged for insertion and the use of Dutch discourse markers, there is no clear preference for either direction.

In order to check for developmental trends, intersentential codeswitching is broken down per session in Table 6. This is important against the background that increasing proficiency in Dutch and acquisition of the parental mixed lect should both aid the increase in alternational CS. As the table shows, this expectation is not confirmed at all. The picture that arises is one of unconstrained variation. Developmental trends can, therefore, not be deduced.

Almost all of these switches occur between full utterances. Only four cases, all by Filiz, involve a language switch between two clauses. This includes the utterance in (8), in which only the introducing conjunction is Dutch:

Table 6. Distribution in absolute numbers of the informants' intersentential codeswitches in absolute numbers, according to direction (to Turkish or Dutch) and time (sessions I-VII).

Informant	Direction	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	Total
Selma	Turkish	1	3	7	13	4	1	1	30
	Dutch	11	-	4	1	5	2	-	23
Berrin	Turkish	1	15	2	9	8	12	9	56
	Dutch	4	11	100	46	14	21	13	209
Filiz	Turkish	15	22	110	79	37	60	6	329
	Dutch	16	4	13	14	17	64	8	136
Ṭükran	Turkish	53	32	3	47	89	33	23	280
	Dutch	6	11	5	17	9	15	9	72

(8) *bu keçi en:* ***bu*** *koyun.* f30t,9
this (is a) goat **and** this (is a) sheep.

Due to the 'one-person-one-language' strategy applied by the adult interviewers, switches to Dutch were all directed at Turkish bilinguals, and most of the switches to Turkish occurred in speech directed at the Dutch interviewer and other Dutch monolinguals. A small number, however, was addressed to Turkish bilinguals, both adults and children, who had started their contribution to the conversation in Dutch.

Regarding the content, switches to Dutch mainly concern single ja 'yes; yeah' or, to a lesser degree, nee 'no', in simple, one-word, turns. Especially Berrin's large number of alternational switches to Dutch, cf. Table 1, is accounted for by this type. One typical sequence is given in (9).

(9) fun34t,2

sibel:	*burda mý kapanýyo bu*?	does it close here?
filiz:	***ja***.	**yes**.
sibel:	*oldu:*.	okay.
sibel:	*kitap # bunlar da oyunca:k*.	a book # and those are toys.
filiz:	*# be:n buna yapalým*.	# I let's do with this.
sibel:	*onla mý oynýyalým*?	shall we play with this?
filiz:	***ja***.	**yes**.
sibel:	*bu da bize baksýn*.	and let this one look at us.
filiz:	***ja***.	**yes**.
sibel:	*## anne her tarafý süpürüyo değil mi*?	your mother is sweeping everywhere, isn't she?
filiz:	***echt wel***.	**definitely**.

Sometimes, a Dutch conversational idiom pops up, especially in the speech of Filiz and Ṭükran (for example, *echt wel* 'definitely', in Ex. 9). Single Dutch lexemes for untranslatable items or not immediately retrievable words also ended up as alternational switches sometimes, if they constituted a one-word utterance, cf. (10).

(10) seh30t,6

sibel:	*ne o dýţarda*?	what's that outside?
selma:	# ***sneeuwpop***.	# **snowman**.

In contrast, switches to Turkish mostly concerned multiple word utterances consisting of more than standardized, formulaic content (see 11). This asymmetry is, interestingly, also found in the adult data (Backus, 2000).

(11) f28n,6

hanneke:	***zie je die kip ook op de plaat***?	**do you also see that chicken on the picture**?
filiz:	*iki tane var*.	there are two (of them).
filiz:	*iki tane*.	two.
hanneke:	*hmhm*.	…
hanneke:	***maar waar staat die andere dan***?	**but where is that other one then**?
filiz:	*bir tane var*!	there is one (of them).

One of the most obvious parallels between the child and adult data is the choice of Dutch words. We can only fruitfully talk about children and adults sharing the same lect if they use the same words. Large-scale investigations into the lexicon of the Turkish community in Holland are lacking, which makes it hard to point to any Dutch word in the child data and say "there, that's also in use by the adults in the community". The corpus needed for such a demonstration simply doesn't exist, so that all we can do is use our intuitions and experiences.

In any case, many switches, particularly single noun switches, concern words for culture-specific concepts, i.e. lexemes which do not have an equivalent in Turkish, but would have to be paraphrased. Cultural customs and food are typical examples; incidentally, it is interesting to note that this category, in particular, yields examples of CS in either direction, cf. (12). More interesting perhaps, is the group of words which are apparently more easily available in Dutch, since they are related to a domain which is mostly discussed in that language. It is generally accepted that many words in, for example, the field of education, or that are related to certain specific socio-cultural contexts, such as toys and pets, tend to be acquired in Dutch first (cf. Schaufeli, 1991). Words in semantic fields dominated by the language of the host country tend to be in that language in the spontaneous speech of the bilingual adults. On the other hand, words related to the home environment and household are generally acquired first in Turkish, and are seldom replaced by their Dutch equivalents in adult speech. Though this accounts for a considerable portion of the Dutch words used by the children, the data also show that there is individual variation. While Filiz (age 3;4) typically uses *knikker*, Berrin (age 2;10) switches to *bilye* 'marble'; whereas Filiz very frequently switches to Dutch for the lexeme ijs 'ice cream', Berrin only seems to use the Turkish equivalent *dondurma*. The ethno-cultural identity of the object mentioned sometimes plays a decisive role in this. This would imply the use of

Turkish yemek to refer to Turkish food, whereas its equivalent *eten* is used to refer to Dutch food, much the same as the use of the *koffie/kahve* 'coffee' pair, referring to coffee prepared in Dutch and Turkish fashion respectively, in the child data of Boeschoten & Verhoeven (1987).

(12) a. *ţimdi ben **pepernoot** yapýyom*. b34t,5
"now I'm making **spice nuts**" (base language is Turkish)
b. *en im **köfte** eten*. h33n,7
"and eat **meatballs**." (base language is Dutch)

Summary and discussion

It is clear that, although the absolute numbers of codeswitches vary considerably among the informants, they show striking similarities in their preferences concerning base language and type of codeswitching. For all informants, Turkish is the preferred base language for insertional CS and for the importation of discourse markers from the other language, during the entire period of data collection. Alternation is by far the more frequently used type of CS. Structural characteristics of the children's codeswitches also show substantial similarities and few idiosyncracies. The main difference between the informants concerns the frequency and diversity of switching. Filiz proves to be a far more frequent and a more varied switcher than the other informants. Apart from this somewhat extreme asymmetry between insertion and alternation, these results confirm the findings of others who studied CS by children growing up in bilingual communities (e.g. McClure, 1981, and Moffatt & Milroy, 1992).

The similarities and differences between the child data presented here and the adult data in earlier publications on Turkish-Dutch CS may be summarized as follows:

(13) Similarities:
a. The Turkish vernacular is more bilingual than the Dutch vernacular.
b. Most insertions are morphosyntactically embedded in the base language.
c. The prototypical Dutch insertion is a content word, mostly a noun, affixed with appropriate Turkish inflection, and occupying the clausal positions Turkish syntax dictates.
d. The choice of Dutch insertions is relatively predictable
e. Inserted Dutch adjectives are virtually always used predicatively.
f. The most frequently inserted Dutch adverbs are discourse markers.
g. Use of Dutch discourse markers resembles the use of Dutch content words. Dutch discourse markers in Turkish are used more often than Turkish discourse markers in Dutch.
h. Turkish utterances are often preceded or followed by a Dutch term of negation or affirmation.
i. The prototype of alternational CS is the intersentential switch.
j. Alternational switches to Turkish concern more expanded and complex stretches of speech than switches to Dutch.

(14) Differences:
   a. The children use Dutch spatial adverbs in Turkish utterances.
   b. The children use Dutch personal and demonstrative pronouns in Turkish clauses.
   c. Use of inserted Dutch verbs is rare in the child data.
   d. The children never place Dutch discourse markers in the middle of the matrix utterance.

The similarities may be the result of conventionalized CS patterns in the bilingual input the informants receive. This mixed way of speaking consists mainly of regular alternation of portions of speech that are monolingual in the two languages and the insertion of Dutch elements into Turkish matrix utterances. This way of speaking does not disappear with increasing proficiency in Dutch (cf. Moffatt & Milroy, 1992). How to represent this type of speech is a difficult issue, and not one we can handle in the space of this discussion. The individual differences between the informants deny the interpretation that the children are learning a fixed and focused mixed system. Within the limits indicated by the above-mentioned characteristics, community norms seem diffuse enough to let children alternate the languages as much or as little as they want.

The differences, especially (14a-c), are intriguing, because they all seem to be related to a lack of congruence between Turkish and Dutch. Turkish spatial adverbs are case-marked, Dutch ones are not; Dutch pronouns are obligatory, while Turkish is a pro-drop language; and Dutch verb stems cannot be inserted into Turkish verb phrases just like that: they first need to be "nativized" through suffixation with *yap*= `do'. That the children use Dutch spatial adverbs and pronouns in their Turkish may be a reflection of a strategy to simplify the Turkish system somewhat, by using invariant forms (the adverbs) and unambiguous discourse tracking devices (pronouns). The compound verb construction might simply take time to learn, and only really takes off in speakers' grammars once they start using a greater number of Dutch verbs (i.e. with increasing proficiency in Dutch).

Despite these differences, we hope to have demonstrated that the children are successfully acquiring a mixed way of speaking that is typical for the Turkish immigrant community in general, and which is mainly characterized by a liberal attitude towards language choice, fairly loose norms about when and where to switch, but also by the development of some fixed norms, especially regarding insertional CS into Dutch and the use of Dutch discourse markers. This last feature is indicative of a developing mixed lect, but as long as the first two features persist, variability will outweigh conventionalization. Put another way, there is evidence for local conventionalization of mixed patterns, but not much for global conventionalization of a mixed language.

References

Agnihotri, R. (1979). *Processes of assimilation: a sociolinguistic study of Sikh children in Leeds*. York: University of York, Unpubl. Ph.D thesis.

Auer, P. (Ed.) (1998). *Code-switching in conversation. Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.

Backus, A. (1992). *Patterns of language mixing. A study in Turkish-Dutch bilingualism*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

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

Backus, A. (1999). The intergenerational codeswitching continuum in an immigrant community. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Bilingualism and Migration*. (Studies on Language Acquisition 14) (pp. 261-279). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Backus, A. (2000). The role of the lexicon in alternational codeswitching. Paper presented at 7th International Conference on Pragmatics, Budapest.

Backus, A. & Boeschoten, H. (1996). Turkish-Dutch codeswitching and levels of lexical structure. Paper presented at Linguistic Society of America Annual Conference, San Diego.

Backus, A. & Van der Heijden, H. (1998). Life and birth of a bilingual: the mixed code of bilingual children and adults in the Turkish community in the Netherlands. In L. Johanson, in cooperation with E. Csato, V. Locke, A. Menz & D. Winterling (Eds.), *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics August 3-6, 1994.* (Turkologica 32) (pp. 527-551). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bentahila, A. & E. Davies (1991). Code-switching and language dominance. In R. Harris (Ed.), *Cognitive processing in bilinguals* (pp. 443-458). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Bentahila, A. & E. Davies (1994). Two languages, three varieties: a look at some bilingual children's codeswitching. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *The cross-linguistic study of bilingual development* (pp. 113-128). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Berk-Seligson, S. (1986). Linguistic constraints on intra-sentential code-switching: A study of Spanish/Hebrew bilingualism. *Language in Society*, 15, 313-348.

Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (1987). Language-mixing in children's speech: Dutch language use in Turkish discourse. *Language Learning*, 37, 191-215.

De Houwer, A. (1990). *The acquisition of two languages from birth: a case study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halmari, H. (1997). *Government and codeswitching. Explaining American Finnish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Halmari, H. & Smith, W. (1994). Code-switching and register shift: Evidence from Finnish-English child bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21, 427-445.

Jake, J. (1994). Intrasentential code switching and pronouns: on the categorial status of functional elements. *Linguistics*, 32, 271-298.

Johanson, L. (1993). Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Immigrant languages in Europe* (pp. 197-221). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lanza, E. (1993). Language mixing and language dominance in bilingual first language acquisition. In E. Clark (Ed.), *The proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual child language research forum* (pp. 197-208). Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

McClure, E. (1981). Formal and functional aspects of the code switched discourse of bilingual children. In R. Duran (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behavior* (pp. 69-94). New Jersey: Ablex.

Meisel, J. (1990). *Codeswitching and related phenomena in young bilingual children. ESF Scientific Networks – Network on code-switching and language contact, Papers for the workshop on concepts, methodology and data*. (pp. 143-68). Strasbourg: ESF.

Moffatt, S. & Milroy, L. (1992). Panjabi/English language alternation in the early school years. *Multilingua* 11, 4, 355-85.

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

Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). *Duelling languages. Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (2nd edition).

Nortier, J. (1989). *Dutch and Moroccan Arabic in contact: Codeswitching among Moroccans in the Netherlands*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Petersen, J. (1988). Word-internal code-switching constraints in a bilingual child's grammar. *Linguistics*, 26, 479-93.

Pfaff, C. (1999). Changing patterns of language mixing in a bilingual child. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *Bilingualism and migration*. (Studies on Language Acquisition 14) (pp. 97-121). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAŃOL: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18, 581-618.

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell. (2nd ed.)

Schaufeli, A. (1991). *Turkish in an immigrant setting. A comparative study of the first language of monolingual and bilingual Turkish children*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

Schlyter, S. (1987). Language mixing and linguistic level in three bilingual children. *Scandinavian Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 7, 29-48.

Singh, R. & A. Backus. (2000). Bilingual proficiency and code-switching/mixing patterns. In R. Singh (Ed.), *The yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2000*, (pp. 61-91). New Delhi: Sage.

Türker, E. (2000). *Turkish-Norwegian codeswitching. Evidence from intermediate and second generation Turkish immigrants in Norway*. Oslo: Unipub Forlag.

Van der Heijden, H. (1997). YAPMAK eyleminin tekdilli ve ikidilli ortamlardaki edinimi. Paper presented at XI. Dilbilim Kurultayý, Ankara.

Van der Heijden, H, & Verhoeven, L. (1994). Early bilingual development of Turkish children in the Netherlands. In G. Extra & L. Verhoeven (Eds.), *The cross-linguistic study of bilingual development* (pp. 51-73). Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen.

Vihman, M. M. (1998). A developmental perspective on codeswitching: conversations between a pair of bilingual siblings. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 2 (1), 45-84.