

# **Dutch Turkish diverging from Turkey-Turkish: A judgment task study on how Dutch Turkish employs subordination and word order**

**Pelin Onar Valk**  
Tilburg University  
*pelinonar@gmail.com*

Languages in contact often start resembling each other if a considerable number of speakers of one language have competence in the other, leading to what is called ‘convergence’ (Aikhenvald, 2010:1). Thus, while Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands adapt themselves to the Standard Turkish norms, their Turkish is being influenced by the Dutch they also speak. This study will investigate structural change, an outcome of language contact, particularly focusing on *subordination*, in immigrant Dutch Turkish, a minority language in the Netherlands. There is an agreement in the literature that ‘analytic’ (Dutch-like) constructions are favored over ‘synthetic’ (Turkish-like) constructions, so the former are easily copied. This study uses ‘comprehension’ and ‘judgment data’, containing Likert scale and forced-choice items, in order to get a more complete picture of language contact effects in the domain of *subordination* in Dutch Turkish. Three groups of participants took part in this study: bilinguals in bilingual mode, monolinguals in Turkey, and bilinguals in monolingual mode. The comprehension data are compared to another recent study (Onar Valk & Backus, forthc.) which looked at *subordination* but based on production data. The results show that change is occurring in Dutch Turkish. The data indicated that bilinguals rate the canonical TR-Turkish constructions as high as monolinguals do; they differ from monolinguals only in giving much more positive judgments for Dutch-like constructions in Turkish. Turkish constructions are still available in the linguistic competence of the speakers, but not used as frequently as the Dutch-like alternatives.

*Keywords: contact-induced change; subordinate clauses; reported speech; Turkish; experimental data; word order; judgment task*

## **1 Contact-induced language change and immigrant Turkish in the Netherlands**

### **1.1 Why change?**

When speakers of different languages come into contact, they unconsciously tend to arrive at a compromise between their forms of speech. During every day communication, speakers borrow linguistic properties of another language when they have some knowledge of that other language. These synchronic decisions, when repeated often enough, lead to diachronic, long-term effects on the language. Bilingualism, therefore, often results in a

compromise between the two languages. This compromise is usually unidirectional because of status differences of the languages involved (Winford, 2003:2). Thus, languages in contact often start resembling each other if a considerable number of speakers of one language have some competence in the other one as well, leading to ‘convergence’ (Aikhenvald, 2010:1).

Language contact may involve different types of linguistic outcomes, which can be referred to synchronically as codeswitching, loan-translation, lexical and structural borrowing, and diachronically as lexical and structural change (Winford, 2003:2).

This study focuses on structural change. Structural changes are classified based on their stability. Based on Aikhenvald (2010:5), I construct a continuum of three levels of change starting with ‘momentary cases of interference’, ‘on-going (continuous) changes’ and ‘completed changes’. The first step, interference, encompasses momentary divergences and is characteristic of individuals. In the case of a ‘completed’ change, there is no longer synchronic variation (the inherited structure is no longer in use), whereas with an ‘on-going’ change, such variation is still visible.

Both language external (social) and language internal (linguistic) factors play a role in contact-induced language change. Language external/social factors include the intensity of contact and interaction, prestige relationships, and attitudes toward the two languages, which largely determine the degree of influence those languages have on each other cross-linguistically (quantitative dimension). Language internal/linguistic factors concern the qualitative aspect of determining what changes occur (lexical content words, function words, or structures) given the intensity of contact and frequency of use of the two languages and specific forms (Doğruöz & Backus, 2007: 186). Some elements or structures are thought to be more ‘attractive’ than others, attractive structures are more easily borrowed (Johanson, 2002:41).

This study will investigate immigrant Turkish in the Netherlands (NL-Turkish). The Turkish-Dutch pair is a relatively young setting involving typologically different languages with a status asymmetry between them.

## **1.2 Immigrant Turkish and Turks in Western Europe**

Turkic languages are spoken across a large area stretching from Bosnia to China and from southern Persia to the Arctic Ocean. Thanks to large-scale immigration, Western Europe also has been host to Turkish for decades (Johanson, 2002:3). The Turkish immigrant wave to Western Europe (mostly to Germany, but sizeable groups to other countries including the Netherlands as well) started in the 1960s in the form of labor migration. Initially, migrants intended to return to Turkey after a few years, however, many eventually settled down in Europe with their families. Presently, the Turkish migrant community is well into its third generation (Backus 2010).

The community has managed to have a high rate of Turkish language maintenance, due to a few factors. First, there has been a trend of marrying spouses from Turkey (although recently members of the community have started to marry among themselves as well). Another important factor is that

it has proved relatively easy to keep strong ties with Turkey and the Turkish language through frequent long holidays in Turkey and consuming Turkish media (TV, internet, etc.). Finally, it should be noted that the Turkish migrant community is very close knit, which enables the continuity of Turkish language transmission. On the other hand, a unidirectional contact influence is also inevitable as Dutch is the dominant language in society. Thus, while the Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands adapt themselves to the norms of Standard Turkish, their Turkish is also constantly being influenced by the Dutch they also speak. As a result of language contact, slowly but surely, the migrants' Turkish seems to be changing; on the one hand through the loss of features, and, on the other hand, through the influx of words and structures taken from Dutch. This study will show that bilingual Dutch/Turkish speakers rate Dutch-like structures in Turkish significantly better than monolingual Turkish speakers do, but that does not imply the loss of inherited Turkey-Turkish structures.

## **2 Subordination, word order and contact-induced change**

Turkish clausal subordination is claimed to be unstable (Johanson 2002: 119). Both for production and for perception, it is also argued to be difficult and, thus, prone to influence in contact situations. There seems to be agreement in the literature that 'analytic' constructions are favored, and found more 'attractive' than 'synthetic' ones, so the former are easily copied. In contact settings with the right conditions, then, a language may replace a synthetic structure with an analytic structure borrowed from the other language (Johanson, 2002:44). In the domain of subordination, Dutch has a more syntactic (i.e. analytic) structure than Turkish which makes more use of morphological (i.e. synthetic) constructions.

This hypothesis was first explored in acquisition studies (Verhoeven & Boeschoten 1986; Schaufeli 1991). Bilingual children were shown to prefer analytical types of subordination (using finite subordinate clauses) and to make limited use of non-finite, synthetic, subordinate clauses compared to monolingual children in Turkey. In older bilingual children and adults, however, the fate of Turkish subordination has not been investigated yet in a systematic way, and this is what motivated the present study.

In addition to finiteness and the synthetic or analytic nature of subordination, Turkish and Dutch differ also in word order. In the Dutch immigration context, Turkish word order was investigated by Schaufeli (1991) and Dođruöz & Backus (2007), and briefly in an MA thesis by Sevinç (2012). The first two studies did not find any significant differences in terms of word order between TR- and NL-Turkish based on their frequency data. Sevinç, comparing three generations of bilinguals, attested some unconventional word order patterns in the Turkish of a third generation bilingual, suggesting there is ongoing change, but the low number of participants and lack of comparison between bilinguals and their monolingual peers from Turkey do not allow strong conclusions.

In a recent study, Onar Valk & Backus (forthc.) found statistically significant differences between Turkish monolinguals and Turkish-Dutch bilinguals in their use of subordinate structures, based on production data,

employing both spontaneous conversations and a controlled elicitation task in which participants had to repeat sequences of three or four sentences. The research question behind the current study is whether or not this pattern also occurs in ‘comprehension’ data. If so, this would constitute more robust evidence that contact-induced language change is taking place regarding subordination in Dutch (NL) Turkish. In comparison to production, comprehension data can also test whether what does not occur has been lost from linguistic competence.

Participants carried out a judgment task containing Likert-scale and forced-choice test items. First, sections 2.1 and 2.2 below will introduce the main characteristics of subordination and its most frequently used sub-type, reported speech, in Turkish and Dutch. Methods, results and conclusions will be discussed in Sections 3, 4, and 5 respectively. The two languages differ considerably from each other in this syntactic domain, which is useful for determining whether we are indeed dealing with contact-induced change when we find differences between NL- and TR-Turkish.

## 2.1 Subordinate clauses

Turkish and Dutch exhibit different characteristics in terms of subordination. More specifically, Turkish employs both finite and non-finite subordinate clauses while Dutch subordination only uses the finite option, at least for the specific corresponding structures under investigation here. A short overview of Turkish and Dutch subordination will be introduced in this section with a few examples from the data, but for a more detailed description on subordination.<sup>1</sup>

### 2.1.1 Subordination in Turkish

Although Turkish subordination is claimed to be mostly non-finite (Göksel & Kerslake 2005:135), the same meaning can often be conveyed with both finite and non-finite constructions.

**Finite** subordination means that the verb of the subordinate clause is inflected with tense, aspect and/or person markers, just like in a main clause. Finite subordinate clauses can be juxtaposed to the main clause, or linked to it, often with the use of a subordinator, such as *diye* and *ki* in the following examples (*diye* is originally a quotative, and *ki* is the closest equivalent in Turkish to the basic complementizer ‘that’):

A **non-finite** subordinate clause contains a non-finite verbal predicate marked with one of the many subordination markers that form nominalizations or converbs. Turkish is generally presented as a language with non-finite subordination, despite the existence of the finite options. The non-finite structures are argued to be much more frequent.

Onar Valk & Backus (forthc.) have shown that bilingual participants prefer finite subordination and use it more frequently than Turkish

---

<sup>1</sup> See Onar Valk & Backus (forthc.), and for Turkish subordination only dip into descriptive grammar books, e.g. Göksel & Kerslake (2005).

monolinguals who show the opposite pattern. Thus, it seems that subordination is changing under Dutch influence.

- (1) Bak-mış-lar            administratie'de            [ne  
*look-Past-3pl*            *administration-LOC*            [*how*  
**kadar**            **ver-ebil-ir-ler]**  
*much*            *give-CANmodal-AOR-3pl*  
 'They looked in the register (to see) how much they can give'  
 (Finite)

*Administratie'de*            [ne            **kadar**  
*administration-LOC*            [*how*            *much*  
**ver-ebil-ecek-ler-i-ne]**            bak-mış-lar  
*give-CAN-CV-3pl-poss.-DAT]*            *look-Past-3pl*  
 (Non-finite)

- (2) Ben    zannet-ti-m            [yeni            **al-mış-sın]**  
*I*            *think-Past-1sg*            *just*            *buy-Nar.Past-2sg*  
 "I thought you just bought it"  
 (Finite)

Ben    [yeni    **al-dıĝ-ı-nı]**            zannet-ti-m  
*I*            [*just*    *buy-F.NMLZ-3sg-ACC]*            *think-Past-1sg*  
 (Non-Finite)

### 2.1.2 Subordination in Dutch

Dutch only uses finite subordination in the structures that correspond to Turkish complement, relative, and adverbial clauses. Dutch subordinate clauses are connected to the main clause with subordinators or conjunctions such as *dat* 'that', *omdat* 'because', etc. Some examples of finite subordinate clauses are given below (Onar Valk & Backus, forthc.). Example 4 shows that coordinated clauses are also finite.

- (3) Ik    denk            [**dat**            mijn            moeder  
*I*            *think.1SG*            *that*            *my*            *mother*  
 een            lekker            broodje            **heeft**            **gebakken]**  
*a*            *delicious*            *roll*            *have.PRS.3SG*            *bake.PST.PTCP*  
 'I think that my mother baked delicious roll'  
 (Complement clause)

- (4) **Gaan**            jullie    naar            de            bioscoop            **of**  
*go-PRS.2PL*            *you.PL*            *to*            *the*            *cinema*            *or*  
**kijken**            jullie            thuis            naar            een            filmpje?  
*watch.PRS.2PL*            *you.PL*            *at.home*            *to*            *a*            *movie*  
 'Are you going to the cinema or are you watching a movie at home?'  
 (Conjunctions)

## 2.2 Reported Speech structures

*Reported Speech* (RS) is a subcategory of subordination. I paid special attention to it as it was observed to be extremely different from TR-Turkish in the data reported on by Onar Valk & Backus (forthc.). As a subcategory of subordination, RS constructions differ between Turkish and Dutch. More specifically, Turkish makes use of *finite* subordination for *direct RS* and non-finite subordination for *indirect RS* (Kornfilt, 1997:3). Dutch, once more, only has finite options for both types.

### 2.2.1 Reported Speech in Turkish

Like subordination in general, RS can be expressed through non-finite and finite constructions in Turkish. Indirect RS is constructed with non-finite subordination, but direct speech is expressed through finite subordinate clauses: the quoted speech is presented as a full clause, including a finite verb. Direct speech can additionally be marked with the subordinators *ki* and *diye* (recall that the latter is originally a quotative), and the matrix verb is generally **de-** ‘say’. The following direct speech examples are taken from a corpus of production data that I created. The indirect speech versions were the TR-Turkish monolingual preferences. They were used significantly less frequently by bilinguals (Onar Valk & Backus, forthc.).

- (5) Ban-a            de-di                    hamile-yim<sup>2</sup>  
*I-DAT            say-PAST.3sg            pregnant-Pres.1sg*  
 ‘She said to me “I am pregnant”’  
(Direct RS-Finite)

Ban-a    **[hamile            ol-duğ-u-nu]**                    söyle-di.  
*I-DAT    [pregnant            be-FNom-3.sgPoss.-ACC]*  
(Ind.RS- Non-finite)

- (6) Geçenlerde        Semra’ya                    **sor-du-m**            Manolya  
*lately                    Semra-DAT                    ask-Past-1sg            Manolya*  
 iş            bul-du                    mu  
*work            find-Past                    Quest.Part*  
 ‘I asked Semra the other day: “Did Manolya find a job?”’  
(Direct RS-Finite)

Geçenlerde        Semra’ya                    [Manolya’nın        iş  
*lately                    Semra-DAT                    [Manolya-GEN        work*  
 bul-up            bul-ma-dığ-ı-nı]                    **sor-du-m**  
*find-CV            find,NEG FNom-3.sgPoss.-ACC] ask-Past-1sg*  
 ‘I asked Semra whether Manolya found a job or not’  
(Ind.RS-Non-finite)

<sup>2</sup> Example 5 was used also in Onar Valk & Backus (forthc.)

As seen in these examples, the embedded clause expresses indirect speech. Its possessive agreement marker and accusative case marking show that the embedded clause is nominal. The embedded clause functions as the direct object of the main clause.

### 2.2.2 Reported Speech in Dutch

In Dutch, both direct and indirect reported speech are encoded through finite subordination, as in the following (self-constructed) examples:

- (7) Hij zegt Ik slaap 8 uur per nacht  
 'He says "I sleep 8 hours per night"'  
 'He says "I sleep 8 hours per night"'  
 (Direct RS-finite)

- (8) Hij zei **dat** hij 8 uur per nacht  
 He said that he 8 hours per night  
 heeft geslapen  
 have.PRS.3SG sleep  
 'He said that he slept 8 hours per night'  
 (Indirect RS-finite)

### 2.2.3 Reporting verb positioning in Dutch Turkish

Turkish is considered a verb-final language. Although it can be claimed to have a relatively free word order, it is canonically verb-final (SOV). Dutch, on the other hand, is a verb-medial language, more specifically verb-second, at least in main clauses (SVO). In reported speech contexts, the matrix verb, therefore, occurs before the reported speech. However, the direct speech constructions in examples 5 and 6 were typical for the Turkish-Dutch bilinguals. They are not sentences easily produced by Turkish, monolinguals, as they do not conform to the canonical Turkish word order. The reporting verb is placed before the (reported speech) subordination.

The message can be conveyed through direct speech in TR-Turkish as well, but the reporting verbs 'dedi' *say* (past) and 'sordum' *ask* (past), according to canonical word order, would be placed at the very end of the sentences, after the subordination.

- (9) Ban-a hamile-yim de-di.  
 I-DAT pregnant-Pres.1sg say-PAST.3sg  
 (Direct RS-Finite)
- Geçenlerde Semra'ya Manolya iş  
 lately Semra-DAT Manolya work  
 bul-du mu diye **sor-du-m**  
 find-Past Quest.Part that ask-Past-1sg  
 (Direct RS-Finite)

Contact-induced changes regarding reporting verb placement in reported speech constructions were attested in both spontaneous conversation and elicited production data of my corpus. The present study reports on a judgment task which was carried out to see whether we could reproduce these contact effects in comprehension data as well. If receptive and productive data converge, this would constitute more robust evidence that there is indeed ongoing language change. Specifically, my aim is to get a fuller answer to the question of whether Dutch Turkish has begun adopting Dutch verb-medial word order in addition to a preference for finite subordination.

### 3 Methodology

Most of the studies in contact linguistics so far have been based on spontaneous speech data. Although it is crucial to investigate language production, specifically everyday speech, such data cannot tell us everything. Everyday speech displays what occurs and what is possible in language use, but do not demonstrate what *does not* occur, and if what does not occur is impossible. Moreover, spontaneous data do not give much information on how entrenched and conventionalized the encountered constructions really are in speakers' linguistic competence. Thus, investigations on comprehension based on judgment tasks, for instance, should also be carried out.

This study used such 'comprehension' or 'judgment data', in order to get a more complete picture of language contact effects in the domain of 'subordination' or 'complex clause combinations' in the minority language Dutch Turkish, spoken in the Turkish immigrant community in the Netherlands.

#### 3.1 Judgment task

The judgment task was constructed on a computer program called *LimeSurvey* and also had to be carried out on the computer. The bilingual participants in the Netherlands were gathered in the computer lab of Tilburg University, whereas the monolinguals in Turkey did the task anywhere where they had an individual computer at their disposal, e.g. in class, at the university, at home, etc.

The judgment task contained a Likert scale and forced-choice test items. Most of the test items were taken from a previously recorded group of conversations which were conducted in a bilingual mode and contained many instances of codeswitching. Almost all the test items with a finite subordination structure came from 'real speech' data, but some types of non-finite test items (e.g. indirect reported speech) had to be constructed, since the speech data contained too few of them. The judgment task was prepared in two conditions: in a bilingual mode, and in a monolingual mode, using the same 'attested' data as a basis. For the monolingual mode, the codeswitched parts were translated into Turkish; the resulting task was carried out by monolinguals in Turkey and by a group of bilingual participants in the Netherlands that was composed of different people than the group that carried out the task in the bilingual mode. In the end, there were two different sets of

judgment task items: one for Turkish-Dutch bilinguals in bilingual mode, and one for monolinguals and bilinguals in monolingual mode.

In the bilingual mode, items included codeswitching. These were either taken verbatim from the recorded conversation or based on these ‘attested’ data. Therefore, they contained natural codeswitches. Two bilingual research assistants provided further input on naturalness and helped in creating natural ‘codeswitched’ parts, which was especially needed for some test items that included non-finite subordination.

One of the bilingual assistants led the bilingual mode sessions by welcoming, instructing and guiding the participants, using a bilingual mode of conversation, before they actually started doing the task. They were asked, in the written instruction and also orally, not to evaluate whether the mixing of languages sounds fine or whether a monolingual version would be preferred, but rather to focus on the language use. In that way, their attention was explicitly directed to the constructions. The instruction they were given for the Likert scale items was as follows (translated from Turkish):

“Please read the sentences below and rate them between 1 and 7 based on the Turkish spoken in the NL among young Turkish-Dutch people around you. Treat codeswitching as ‘natural’. Language mixing is accepted as ‘normal’ in bilingual communities, such as ours. While grading, ask yourself this question: “How often do I hear this type of sentence around me?” Focus on the language use and grammar, not on the meaning and vocabulary during the task. “1” means *never used this way* and “7” *always used by everybody this way.*”

Participants read the instructions together with the investigator (the author) at the beginning of the session, to ensure that everything was clear to everyone, and otherwise they could ask questions. The bilingual research assistant answered any questions, and made these clarifications using codeswitching, so as to keep the participants in a bilingual mode.

Participants saw the stimulus sentences one after the other and were asked to judge them by selecting the appropriate number on the scale and clicking the ‘next’ button on the screen to proceed. They were not allowed to skip items. The same instruction was placed under each sentence, as a reminder about what they were supposed to be doing.

The monolingual mode task consisted of the same items except that the codeswitched parts were turned into Turkish. The author, who presented herself as a monolingual Turkish speaker, put monolingual participants in the monolingual mode by using only Turkish from the moment they met. The procedure was the same as in the bilingual mode. The instruction was also the same except that the comment on codeswitching was left out.

The same monolingual mode test items were used for the monolingual control group in Turkey, with a slightly different instruction, to avoid the bilingual focus of the instruction given to the participants in The Netherlands:

“Please read the sentences below and rate them between 1 and 7 based on the Turkish spoken around you. While grading, ask yourself this question: “How often do I hear this type of sentence around me?” Focus on the language use and grammar, not on the

meaning and vocabulary during the task. “1” means *never used this way* and “7” *always used by everybody this way.*”

The second part of the judgment task contained **forced-choice** items. The three groups of participants got the same instruction:

“Which sentence type below do you hear more around you? Select the type you hear most.”

As Turkish allows both finite and non-finite subordination, one message can very well be conveyed through either structure. Therefore, in this part of the task, two, three, or four different sentence structures were constructed to convey the same meaning (e.g., finite and verb final, finite and verb medial, use of complementizer *ki*, non-finite and verb final, etc.). They were presented to the bilinguals as multiple choice items. The participants had to choose the type they thought they heard most around them.

In total, the participants were given 30 sentences to judge on a Likert scale and 20 forced-choice test items, with varying numbers of alternatives to choose from. Around 25 fillers were also included and scattered randomly in the task. The whole judgment task lasted around 30-35 minutes in total.

The monolingual and bilingual mode tasks were carried out by 39 Turkish-Dutch participants each. Thus, 78 bilinguals completed the task. The control group in Turkey consisted of 54 monolinguals.

## 4 Results

The results of the judgment task (comprehension data) confirm findings from Onar Valk & Backus (forthc.) on production data to a great extent. First, the results for the Likert-scale items are reported.

### 4.1 Likert-scale

Table 1 displays the mean scores on the Likert scale items for the three groups: monolinguals, bilinguals in monolingual mode (MM), and bilinguals in bilingual mode (BM). The results are presented separately for items containing finite and non-finite subordination. The right-hand column indicates which differences were statistically significant. The three groups were significantly different from each other with finite stimuli, with a significant p value of .000 (as  $p \geq 0.05$ ). BM bilinguals judged finite stimuli the highest whereas monolinguals had the lowest scores. MM bilinguals' judgments are closer to those of monolinguals. However, with non-finite stimuli, the differences among the three groups were not significant (p value=0.083). Interestingly, bilingual speakers give the non-finite items equally high scores as monolingual speakers.

**Table 1.** Likert scale means with finite/non-finite stimuli

Oneway- ANOVA			
		Mean	Sig.
Finite stimuli	Turkish monolinguals	3.2475	<b>.000</b>
	MM Bilinguals	4.5897	
	BM Bilinguals	5.4006	
Non-finite stimuli	Turkish monolinguals	5.4566	<b>.083</b>
	MM Bilinguals	5.0403	
	BM Bilinguals	5.2601	

When each group was compared to every other one, by means of a one-way ANOVA Post Hoc test, the results show that the differences among all the groups were significant when the participants had to judge finite stimuli, while no significant differences among any groups were observed in judging the non-finite stimuli, as shown in table 2 below. The non-shaded, white, slices in the significance column display the non-significant results.

**Table 2.** Likert scale group comparisons with finite/non-finite stimuli

Post Hoc Tests- Multiple Comparisons (Tukey HSD)					
Dependent Variable	group variable	group variable	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Finite stimuli	<b>Turkish monolinguals</b>	MM Bilinguals	-1.34219	.21447	<b>.000</b>
		BM Bilinguals	-2.15309	.21447	<b>.000</b>
	<b>MM Bilinguals</b>	Turkish monolinguals	1.34219	.21447	<b>.000</b>
		BM Bilinguals	-.81090	.22833	<b>.002</b>
	<b>BM Bilinguals</b>	Turkish monolinguals	2.15309	.21447	<b>.000</b>
		MM Bilinguals	.81090	.22833	<b>.002</b>
Non-finite stimuli	<b>Turkish monolinguals</b>	MM Bilinguals	.41629	.18490	<b>.067</b>
		BM Bilinguals	.19651	.18490	<b>.539</b>
	<b>MM Bilinguals</b>	Turkish monolinguals	-.41629	.18490	<b>.067</b>
		BM Bilinguals	-.21978	.19684	<b>.506</b>
	<b>BM Bilinguals</b>	Turkish monolinguals	-.19651	.18490	<b>.539</b>
		MM Bilinguals	.21978	.19684	<b>.506</b>

We now turn to the items that contained **Reported Speech**. Recall that the participants saw instances of direct and of indirect RS. Table 3 shows the results of an ANOVA analysis. All differences between all groups were significant for direct speech stimuli. That is, monolinguals differed

significantly from bilinguals in both modes, and the bilinguals in the two conditions differed significantly from each other as well, as indicated by the p-values ( $p=.000 \geq 0.05$ ). In the case of indirect speech stimuli, however, no differences were significant, and the mean judgment scores from the groups were similar.

**Table 3.** Likert scale mean with direct/indirect RS stimuli

One-way ANOVA				
		N	Mean	Sig.
<b>Direct speech stimuli</b>	Turkish monolinguals	51	2.9982	<b>.000</b>
	MM Bilinguals	39	4.7040	
	BM Bilinguals	39	5.3590	
<b>Indirect speech stimuli</b>	Turkish monolinguals	51	5.4549	<b>.591</b>
	MM Bilinguals	39	5.2256	
	BM Bilinguals	39	5.2769	

The Post Hoc test that compared all the groups to each other, summarized in Table 4, reflects the ANOVA in Table 3, but shows the comparisons in a more detailed way. Thus, on direct speech test items, in addition to monolinguals' significantly being different from both bilingual groups, BM and MM bilinguals were also seen to be significantly different from each other, while the indirect speech test items did not yield any significant differences among any groups under investigation.

**Table 4.** Likert scale group comparisons with direct/indirect RS stimuli

Post Hoc Test- Multiple Comparisons (Tukey HSD)					
Dependent Variable	group variable	group variable	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
<b>Direct speech stimuli</b>	<b>Turkish monolinguals</b>	MM Bilinguals	-1.70575	.24284	<b>.000</b>
		Turkish monolinguals	1.70575	.24284	<b>.000</b>
	<b>MM Bilinguals</b>	BM Bilinguals	-.65501	.25853	<b>.033</b>
		Turkish monolinguals	2.36076	.24284	<b>.000</b>
<b>Indirect speech stimuli</b>	<b>Turkish monolinguals</b>	MM Bilinguals	.22926	.23886	<b>.604</b>
		BM Bilinguals	.17798	.23886	<b>.737</b>
	<b>MM Bilinguals</b>	Turkish monolinguals	-.22926	.23886	<b>.604</b>
		BM Bilinguals	-.05128	.25428	<b>.978</b>
	<b>BM Bilinguals</b>	Turkish monolinguals	-.17798	.23886	<b>.737</b>
		MM Bilinguals	.05128	.25428	<b>.978</b>

Finally, the data also allow us to look at the position of the reporting verb in reported speech constructions. Table 5 summarizes some remarkable tendencies. There were significant differences among the three groups of participants when they were given verb-medial RS test items. Monolinguals rated these items much lower than *both* bilingual groups. In comparison with the BM group, however, MM bilinguals were closer to monolinguals in the *mean* scores. For verb-final items, on the other hand, no differences were significant and all three *mean* scores were quite close to each other.

**Table 5.** Likert scale mean with RS V\_initial/V\_final stimuli

Oneway-ANOVA				
		N	Mean	Sig.
<b>RS Verb medial</b>	Turkish monolinguals	51	2.9982	<b>.000</b>
	MM Bilinguals	39	4.704	
	BM Bilinguals	39	5.359	
<b>RS Verb final</b>	Turkish monolinguals	51	5.4549	<b>.591</b>
	MM Bilinguals	39	5.2256	
	BM Bilinguals	39	5.2769	

If we zoom in on the groups and compare them with a Post Hoc test, we end up with the data in Table 6, yielding a familiar picture. Again, there are significant differences (all shaded in the table) among all three groups for the non-canonical verb-medial type of RS items, while with verb-final RS test items the analysis revealed the opposite: no significant differences between any of the groups. This is not surprising as Table 5 already showed that the mean scores of the three groups for verb-final judgments were very similar.

**Table 6.** Likert scale group comparisons with RS V\_medial/ V\_final stimuli

Post Hoc Test- Multiple Comparisons (Tukey HSD)					
Dependent Variable	group variable	group variable	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
<b>RS Verb medial</b>	Turkish monolinguals	MM Bilinguals	-1.70575	.24284	<b>.000</b>
		BM Bilinguals	-2.36076	.24284	<b>.000</b>
	MM Bilinguals	Turkish monolinguals	1.70575	.24284	<b>.000</b>
		BM Bilinguals	-.65501	.25853	<b>.033</b>
	BM Bilinguals	Turkish monolinguals	2.36076	.24284	<b>.000</b>
		MM Bilinguals	.65501	.25853	<b>.033</b>
<b>RS Verb final</b>	Turkish monolinguals	MM Bilinguals	.22926	.23886	<b>.604</b>
		BM Bilinguals	.17798	.23886	<b>.737</b>
	MM Bilinguals	Turkish monolinguals	-.22926	.23886	<b>.604</b>
		BM Bilinguals	-.05128	.25428	<b>.978</b>
	BM Bilinguals	Turkish monolinguals	-.17798	.23886	<b>.737</b>
		MM Bilinguals	.05128	.25428	<b>.978</b>

To sum up, the differences turned out to be significant between bilinguals and monolinguals and within the bilingual group between the two modes as long as it concerned stimuli which contained finite subordination, direct speech or verb-medial structures. The groups scored similarly to each other for stimuli with non-finite subordination, indirect speech and verb-final constructions, which are claimed to be canonical in TR-Turkish. Furthermore, bilinguals rated these canonical structures as high as the monolinguals, while monolinguals rated the verb-medial, direct speech and finite (i.e. the non-canonical and more Dutch-like) structures significantly lower than bilinguals. Lastly, the *mean* scores of bilingual participants in the monolingual mode were closer to those of monolinguals than those of bilingual participants in the bilingual mode for these Dutch-like stimuli.

#### 4.2 Forced-choice test

Some test items forced the participants to choose the most conventional option from a set of alternatives. Table 7 shows the preferences of the three groups. The Turkish monolingual group confirms that TR-Turkish prefers non-finite subordination (66.2%), whereas bilinguals (in both modes)

preferred the non-finite option in slightly less than 50% of the cases. Thus, bilinguals demonstrated preference for finite options.

**Table 7.** Forced-choice group comparisons with non-finite choices

Non-finite choices %		
BM	MM	Turkish monolinguals
<b>Non-finite</b>	Non-finite	Non-finite
46.4	<b>46.3</b>	<b>66.2</b>

Direct Speech is one type of finite subordination, and in the majority of cases (almost 60%), BM and MM bilinguals preferred direct speech to indirect speech (which makes use of non-finite constructions). Turkish monolinguals displayed the reverse pattern, with only 29% direct speech preferences, as Table 8 shows.

**Table 8.** Forced-choice group comparisons with direct RS choices

Direct RS choices %		
BM	MM	Turkish monolinguals
<b>Direct Speech</b>	Direct Speech	Direct Speech
59.8	<b>59.5</b>	<b>29.2</b>

Finally, Table 9 shows the preferences for the position of the verb in RS structures. Only 7% of the monolinguals preferred the verb-medial option, while BM and MM participants preferred it in 26 and 28% of the cases, respectively.

**Table 9.** Forced-choice group comparisons with RS V\_medial choices

V-medial RS choices %		
BM	MM	Turkish monolinguals
<b>V_medial</b>	V_medial	V_medial
26.4	<b>28.2</b>	<b>7.3</b>

To summarize, just like with the Likert-scale judgments, clear preference differences were observed between monolinguals and bilinguals for *finite vs non-finite construction*, *direct vs indirect RS constructions*, and *verb-medial vs verb-final constructions*. The scores, though, do not give us reason to claim there are differences between the monolingual and bilingual modes. Apparently, the mode was not a determining factor in selecting one option in the forced-choice condition.

## 5 Discussion and conclusions

The results show compelling evidence that change is occurring in Dutch Turkish. At the very least, this is a change in preferences; whether or not this is interpreted as a change in the syntax of Turkish is a matter of how syntactic change is defined. In any case, subordination in NL-Turkish is different from subordination in TR-Turkish.

Turkish monolinguals and Turkish-Dutch bilinguals differ from each other in how they employ subordination, both in production (Onar-Valk &

Backus, *forthc.*) and, as shown in the present article, in judgment tasks. Given these similarities, we may conclude that the evidence for production and comprehension converges. The judgment data also contain another type of converging evidence since two methods, Likert-scale and forced-choice judgments, yield results in the same direction.

However, not all evidence converges. The data indicated that bilinguals rate the canonical TR-Turkish constructions (non-finite subordination, indirect reported speech, verb-final constructions) the same way as monolinguals do. They differ from monolinguals in their much more positive judgments of Dutch-like constructions in Turkish (finite subordination, direct reported speech, and verb-medial constructions). Thus, the judgment data present results of ‘normal’ rating of canonical structures by bilingual participants who tend to avoid those constructions in actual speech.

While Onar Valk & Backus (*forthc.*) show that, in actual use, bilingual speakers of Dutch and Turkish prefer to use the Dutch-like constructions, their positive judgments of Turkish-like constructions shows that they have not lost them. They are still available in their linguistic competence, but not used as frequently as the Dutch-like alternatives.

It is unknown for how long these structures have already been a prominent part of the immigrant variety since few studies have focused on complex clauses. However, in an early study of the acquisition of Turkish by monolingual and bilingual children, Schaufeli (1991) showed that Turkish-Dutch bilingual children seemed to prefer analytical subordination (i.e., Dutch-like, finite constructions) to the synthetic subordinate structures, in which they differed from a monolingual control group (p:155). This suggests that the data reported on in the present study reflect synchronic changes that began decades ago and find their origin in bilingual acquisition. It is not possible to say whether the change has progressed much since Schaufeli’s study, but the data do suggest that the Dutch-like alternatives have stabilized and the results could be interpreted as straightforward Dutch influence.

Although there are few differences between the judgments made in the bilingual and monolingual modes in the forced-choice task, there is a clear mode effect for the Likert-scale test. It makes sense to think that MM mode performance of bilinguals would be closer to that of monolinguals as the BM mode activates both languages, and thus increases the chance of interference. The results exhibit a picture that could be expected for the Dutch-like structures (the less frequent ones in TR-Turkish), but there were no significant differences between the modes for the default TR-Turkish structures. Whatever the mode, it seems, bilinguals can recognize canonical TR-Turkish patterns as readily as monolinguals do. On the other hand, when the bilingual speakers had to rate Dutch-like structures, their performance in monolingual mode is closer to that of monolinguals and also differs significantly from their performance in bilingual mode. All this suggests that bilingual speakers suppress the Dutch-like structures more when they are in MM, and perhaps activate them more when in BM, but that they have no similar differential activation for TR-Turkish structures.

So far, I have focused on demonstrating that the immigrant variety has conventionalized some Dutch-like structures, but little has been said about

how those differences between TR-Turkish and Dutch Turkish emerged and how the change has propagated.

A first suggestion has to do with register variation. Subordination may be more typical of academic registers, and Turkish-Dutch bilinguals do not normally acquire this register in Turkish, as they go to school in the Netherlands, where the entire curriculum is in Dutch. However, given the scarcity of sociolinguistic register studies on Turkish, this suggestion will not be further developed here.

Whether or not register affiliation of subordinate structures plays a role, a likely scenario for the change is suggested by usage-based linguistics (cf. Bybee's (2006) 'exemplar representation'). In this perspective, 'language change' is characterized as changes in the entrenchment levels of a particular structure. Dutch usage and exposure starts especially after the age of four for Turkish-Dutch bilinguals when they start school, assuming they mostly speak Turkish at home. Thus, they receive Dutch subordination input after the age of four, and perhaps very little Turkish subordination. The frequency of Dutch use and exposure only increases with time, and the entrenchment of Dutch subordination structures will go up accordingly. The separately stored Dutch and Turkish subordinate constructions start competing in the mental representation of the bilingual as matched meaning activates both. Once the entrenchment of the Dutch subordination is higher than the Turkish one, it starts to impose itself in Turkish discourse, which surfaces as 'cross-linguistic influence' or 'interference'. This raises the entrenchment of Dutch schema even further, but also causes further 'disuse' of Turkish subordination, which ultimately leads to decreased entrenchment of the canonical Turkish schema. That is, the entrenchment of the earlier inherited variant (non-finite subordination in this case) goes down and that of a new variant (a borrowed Dutch preference for the finite option) goes up. However, the judgment data suggest that decreased frequency doesn't necessarily lead to decreased entrenchment, at least not very quickly, since the canonical Turkish structures were judged equally high by the bilingual participants as by the monolingual ones.

The results of this paper are also compatible with the idea that analytic structures ('Dutch-like', here) are favoured and more 'attractive' in contact situations (Johanson, 2002:44).

But can we call this difference in preferences and judgments an instance of 'language change'? If change is defined as the introduction of a completely new structure into a language, then the answer is clearly 'no'. None of the Dutch-like structures are ungrammatical in TR-Turkish. However, if mere changes in preference or in frequency are 'counted' (as Johanson 2002 and Heine & Kuteva 2005 do), then, clearly, Dutch Turkish is undergoing change.

Heine (2006) lists various aspects of change, and the more of them apply, the more pervasive is the change: a) narrowing of options, b) shift from one construction to another, c) pragmatic unmarking and d) extension and frequency. The data presented in this study show that there is definitely increased extension and frequency of Dutch-like structures, but there may also be evidence of pragmatic unmarking. Many of the verb-medial sentences would be pragmatically marked in TR-Turkish, but there is no evidence that

they are interpreted as special in any way by the bilingual participants. However, this needs more investigation, which is beyond the scope of this study.

This paper has argued that there is evidence for an ‘on-going structural change’ or ‘structural change in progress’ in Dutch Turkish. I conclude that this change is more ‘a change in preference’ and nowhere near completion. It will be interesting to see how Dutch Turkish subordination patterns will develop in the years to come, as contact with Dutch is likely to continue and perhaps increase in intensity with further integration of the immigrant community into Dutch society.

### References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra (2002). *Language Contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 363 pp.
- Backus, Ad (2010). The role of codeswitching, loan translation and interference in the emergence of an immigrant variety of Turkish. *Working Papers in Corpus-based Linguistics and Language Education*, 5, 225-241.
- Bybee, Joan (2006). From usage to grammar: the mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82(4): 711-733.
- Doğruöz, Seza and Ad Backus (2007). Postverbal elements in immigrant Turkish: Evidence of change? *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 11(2), 185-220.
- Göksel, Aslı and Celia Kerslake (2005) *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva (2005) *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd (2006). Contact-induced word order change without word order change. *Working Papers in Multilingualism* (Hamburg) 76: 1-24. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, Sonderforschungsbereich Mehrsprachigkeit.
- Johanson, Lars (2002). *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. [With an introduction by Bernard Comrie.] London: Curzon.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin (1997) *Turkish*. London: Routledge.
- Onar Valk, Pelin and Ad Backus (forthc.). Change in Dutch Turkish subordination: Syntactic change in an immigrant language: from non-finite to finite subordinate clauses in Turkish. A special issue of *Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* from the *proceedings of the Graduate Conference on Areal Linguistics, Grammar and Contacts*. University of Tartu, Estonia, 2012.
- Schaufeli, A. (1991), *Turkish in an immigrant setting. A comparative study of the first language of monolingual and bilingual Turkish children*, Dissertation, Universität von Amsterdam.
- Sevinç, Yeşim (2012). *Lexical and Structural Changes in Turkish spoken in the Netherlands: Linguistic and Social Factors in Turkish-Dutch Contact*. MA Thesis. Radboud University Nijmegen.

- Verhoeven, Ludo (L. Th.) and Boeschoten, Hendrik (1986). First language acquisition in a second language submersion environment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 7/1986, 241-56.
- Winford, Donald (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. London: Blackwell.