



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Determinants of language use and attitudes among Turkish speakers in Flanders: a focus on generational difference

Altinkamış, N.F.; Agirdag, O.

Published in:
Bilig

DOI:
[10.12995/bilig.2014.7003](https://doi.org/10.12995/bilig.2014.7003)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Altinkamış, N. F., & Ağırdağ, O. (2014). Determinants of language use and attitudes among Turkish speakers in Flanders: a focus on generational difference. *Bilig*, 70, 59-80. <https://doi.org/10.12995/bilig.2014.7003>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Determinants of Language Use and Attitudes among Turkish Speakers in Flanders: A Focus on Generational Difference

N. Feyza Altıncamış*
Orhan Ağırdağ**

Abstract

The focus of this research is Turkish immigrants' language use-preference and language attitudes towards their first language, Turkish, in terms of intergenerational differences in the Flemish speaking part of Belgium. Borrowing the procedure by Yagmur and van de Vijver (2012), 136 participants were given "The Language Use, Choice and Preference Scale" and "The Attitudes to Turkish Language Scale". As we hypothesized that social class, place of birth, gender and age would be related to attitudes to Turkish, they were considered as independent variables in the study. The results indicated that generation with length of residence was significantly associated with some variables. Also, social class was found to be a significant contributor to respondents' attitudes towards Turkish. Gender was not a relevant category in terms of all language outcomes.

Keywords

Language attitudes, Turkish as a minority language, Flanders, language use-preference

* Dr., Ghent University, The Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, Translation, Interpretation and Communication Department, Turkish Section – Ghent / Belgium and Cukurova University, The School of Foreign Languages – Adana / Turkey
feyza.altincamis@ugent.be

** Assist. Prof. Dr., University of Amsterdam, Research Institute of Child Development and Education – Amsterdam / The Netherlands
orhan.agirdag@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The main purpose of this paper is two-fold: to investigate determinants of language use, preference and attitudes among Turkish immigrants in Flanders, Dutch-speaking regional state of Belgium and to see if these determinants change across generations. Overall, this research aims to provide data from the social context of Flanders, with specific reference to Turkish community, one of the largest immigrant groups in Belgium. However; the academic studies related to Turkish population in Belgium in a general sense is quite limited in the field. In line with the recommendations by Sam et al. (2006) and by Yagmur and van de Vijver (2012), we follow a bottom-up perspective and consider context-specific nature of immigrant communities and only focus on Flanders in this study. For cross-cultural studies, Belgium constitutes a good example since it is a completely multicultural society with its immigrant communities from southern Europe, Turkey and North Africa and in its own administrative/social structure with three official languages, Dutch, French and German.

Immigration is a phenomenon which involves various components, the most important of which is language. Language use, choice and maintenance of immigrants are directly related to their ethno-linguistic vitality perceptions in the receiving communities. Studies conducted in France (Yagmur and Akinci 2003) and in Australia, Germany, Netherlands and in France (Yagmur and van de Vijver 2012) with Turkish immigrant groups show that their use of native language depends on their contextual needs. In other words, they prefer their ethnic language in domestic domain and Turkish immigrants with a stronger Turkish identity consider and use their native language more.

According to Kipp et al. (1995) there are two influential factors on language use in immigrant communities; factors related to the speech community (social) and factors related to individuals (personal). These two factor groups are always in interaction with each other (Yagmur and Akinci 2003). The policy of the host community towards minority languages is necessarily significant on the language attitudes of ethnic groups. The measures taken regarding heritage or host language by governments can create distance or proximity to or from minority or majority languages. Kipp et al. (1995) mention that birthplace, age, period of residence, gender, education/qualifications, reasons of migration and language variety are influential individual factors. Our study also considers some of these individual factors as determinants and analyzes their effects on Turkish group members' language attitudes towards their heritage language; namely, birthplace and age (intergenerational difference) and education/qualification (social class).

In line with this background in the related field, we would like to shed light on the Turkish community in Belgium, particularly the Flemish part of the country and their language maintenance patterns regarding their mother tongue use and attitudes.

1.1. Flemish Context

At the heart of Europe, Belgium is one of the countries which is highly subject to increased international migration. According to Wets (2006), Turks and Moroccans are two main immigrant groups in Belgium and Turks have been reported to be the least integrated group of immigrants in Belgium and also in Austria (Kaya and Kentel 2008). Belgium is a country in the north of West-Europe and surrounded by Netherlands, Germany, Luxembourg and France. It is a small country with an area of 31000 km². Its population is nearly 10 million. Since 1993, Belgium is a federal state and governed through the parliamentary system. Three official languages are spoken in the country: Dutch in the north, French in the south and German in a very small area in the south-east which is next to Germany.

The presence of the first Turkish community in Western Europe goes back to the 1960s and the 1970s. Turkish migration was triggered both by the Turkish government and the receiving countries. At that time, unemployment and the uncontrolled population increase were the main problems that the Turkish state was struggling whereas the Western European countries were in need of labor for manual work. The bilateral agreements between Turkey and European countries were signed on different years, following each other; with Germany in 1961, with Belgium and Austria in 1964. Following the initial migration moves, the Turkish immigration exploded through family reunification, illegal migration and marriage in Western Europe (Backus 2004; Wets 2006). Turkish migrants living in Belgium are mostly from two provinces in Turkey; Eskişehir and Afyon, especially a small administrative district of Afyon; Emirdağ (Quentin 2013).

As this study is directly related to the portion of the federal state where Dutch is the official language in Belgium, we would like to provide some data about Flanders. According to the most recent data, the overall population of Belgium is 10,839.905. The following table shows (Table 1) some further numbers about the immigrants in Belgium in line with the Turkish group. The overall populations of Brussels, of Flanders and of Wallonia are 1,089.538; 6,251.983; 3,498.384 respectively.

Table 1 shows the number of Belgians, of all immigrants and the number of Turkish group in Belgium. According to this information in Table 1, Flanders

is the region where most Turkish population lives. The fundamental reasons of why Flanders is densely populated by Turkish groups can be richer employment opportunities and to some extent better migrant-oriented policy in Flanders. Manço (2000) states that unemployment is gradually decreasing in Flanders and the rate of unemployed Turkish people in Flanders is only 25 %. He also adds that the exact number of self-employed workplaces in Flanders increased from 440 to 900 between 1991-2000.

Table 1. *The population of Belgium in relation to immigrant population*

	Belgians	The number of all immigrants	Turkish immigrants
Brussels	762,468	327,070	10,116
Flanders	5,852,550	399,433	19,587
Wallonia	3,167,221	331,163	10,125
Total	9,782,239	1,057,666	39,828

Data retrieved from <http://statbel.fgov.be/nl/statistieken/cijfers/> on May 5, 2013

Flanders, itself, has been divided into five main administrative provinces. Table 2 shows the number of Turkish community in each province of Flanders. In his report, Manço (2002) refers to a study conducted by Liege University in 1993 and mentions that in Flanders, Turkish people mostly live in Limburg, Ghent and in Antwerp and of all Turks-directed work places in Belgium, 18 % of them is in Limburg, 11 % of them is in Ghent and 10 % of them is in Antwerp.

Table 2. *Flanders population distribution across provinces*

	Belgians	Other Immigrants	Turkish Group
West-Flanders	1,126,354	32,700	312
East-Flanders	1,373,329	51,627	7,370
Antwerp	1,594,385	144,682	5,795
Limburg	762,379	71,487	4,639
Flemish-Brabant	996,103	79,350	1,471
Total	5,852,550	379,846	19,587

Data retrieved from <http://statbel.fgov.be/nl/statistieken/cijfers/> on May 5, 2013

As multiculturalism has widespread all over the world, legislative procedures have been regulated continuously; especially in countries where mixed-cultures live together. From this perspective, Belgium sets a good

example. The policies towards immigrants followed by governments have been said to differentially influential to the integration of immigrant groups into host culture. As Belgium is a federal state, each region –Dutch speaking and French speaking community- is autonomous in itself and is in touch with a different integration policy for immigrants. According to Jacobs and Rea (2006), the Flemish has an extremely mild approach towards the minority groups in comparison to the Francophone approach. They argue that this reflects what the Flemish people have faced as a former minority group in the Belgian history, so they tend not to ignore but to recognize the existence of different minority groups. However, empirical studies on language use of minorities have shown that Flemish multiculturalism does not include linguistic pluralism (see also Jasper 2008; Blommaert et al. 2006; Agirdag et al. 2013). On the contrary, in Flanders there is an enormous social and political pressure on linguistic minorities (such as the speakers of Turkish) to adopt Dutch monolingualism. While the legislation of the French speaking part of Belgium is recently changed to allow bilingual education, bilingual education is still illegal in Flanders (Bollen and Baten 2010). Speakers of other languages are labeled as ‘people who refuse to learn Dutch’ and they are increasingly excluded from the welfare policies such as social housing. According to Agirdag (2010), the aversion towards minority languages are related to historically deep-rooted fears against the dominance of French, and the strong presence of the right-wing Flemish-nationalist politics. The situation of Turkish immigrants in different countries where they are mostly populated differ in terms of acculturation policy of that country. To exemplify; in a comparative study among Australia, Netherlands, France and Germany, Yagmur and van de Vijver (2012) mention that each country goes through a different language policy: pluralist, assimilation, civic and ethnist, respectively. In their study, a close link has been found between language policy followed in the country and the acculturation process of immigrants in that society. Among all four investigated countries, a better integration of Turkish immigrants has been observed in Australia. According to the researchers; this may have derived from the fact that Australia is a country which has long been accepted to be an immigrant country and which has adapted the appropriate policy in line with the context-dependent needs of its people. However; Belgium, though migrant societies have taken place in every side of daily life, still denies that it is an immigrant country as well (Wets 2006). That may be one of the reasons why integration of the immigrants into the mainstream community seems problematic.

1.2. Determinants of Language Use and Attitudes

Starting from original formulation by Giles et al. (1977), language factor has been carefully handled in cross-cultural and multilingualism studies and has been taken into account as an ethnolinguistic behavior (Johnson et al. 1983). The framework by Giles et al. (1977) was considered in various studies as a determinant of ethnolinguistic vitality. The vitality grouping by Giles et al. (1977) has been reviewed and considered in a lot of studies (Sachdev et al. 1987; Bourhis et al. 1981; Yagmur 2004; Yagmur and Akinci 2003) and according to this grouping, it is highly probable in low vitality groups that immigrants are subject to strong linguistic assimilation and people in high vitality groups are more attached to their heritage language and cultural traits. The mutual link between language and identity has always been taken into consideration in the field, particularly guiding more studies in sociolinguistics. For instance; there has been a growing body of sociolinguistic research with Turkish-French bilingual children (Akinci and Decool-Mercier 2010; Akinci 2008), Turkish-Dutch children in the Netherlands (Yagmur 2010a, 2010b; Backus and van der Heijden 1998; 2002) with Turkish-German bilingual children (Pfaff 1994; Kauschke et al. 2007), and acculturation and discourse studies with Turkish-Dutch adults in Netherlands (Arends-Toth and van de Vijver 2003; Phalet et al. 2000; Huls 2000) and in Canadian context (Berry and Kalin 1995). However, research with Turkish-Flemish participants who are unique to Flanders from the sociolinguistics point of view is very rare (for an exception, see Agirdag 2010).

Recalling the individually effective factors on minority groups' language use, attitudes and language maintenance patterns in Kipp et al.'s terms (1995), we aim to re-touch the context-specificity of immigration regarding Turkish community. According to Reitz (1980) minority language knowledge and language use is widespread among adult immigrants, while less prevalent in the second generation and rarely found among the third generation. From the perspective of Turkish immigration, especially the first generation Turkish immigrants came from rural areas of Turkey and they were mostly not well-educated. Both economical and language problems caused them not to interact with the host community particularly for the first and second generation. Currently, the third generation of Turkish people is on the stage in Europe. Despite the Turkish young people's education problems, it should not be ignored that the Turkish speakers abroad has extremely changed in terms of occupational preferences since the 1960s. For example; in Flanders, the first generation Turkish people mostly worked in coal mines in Limburg but in the last ten years, the

second generation Turks have started to start their own companies and the unemployment of Turkish people in Flanders is in decline, so this intergenerational differences in terms of occupational preferences may be influential on Turkish groups' first language use and attitudes. This has also guided us to take generation and social class as significant independent variables in this study. Regarding generation as an operational term, different approaches have been available in the field. For example; in a study by Yagmur (2009), birth country of informants has been considered as a criterion of generation. Turkey-born informants have been associated to being first generation and it has been hypothesized that they would have higher ethno-linguistic vitality than their Netherlands-born peers. However, in another study by Yagmur and Akinci (2003), age has been taken as an indicator of generation. In their study, the participants were classified on the basis of their age as older immigrants (first generation) and younger ones (second generation).

The dynamic changes in Turkish diaspora in Flanders are especially significant in terms of gender. In the first generation Turkish families, women always stayed at home, not educated, busy with household jobs and children. They were not actively engaged in the daily life of the mainstream community, mostly because of the language problem. However; according to Manço (2002), the second generation Turkish women were quite successful at school and they were found to be open to develop in education. Though their increasing academic achievements at school, their societal representation in work sector has been limited. Unemployment rate of women is high and 75 % of the Turkish women in Belgium is unskilled workers, mostly in the cleaning sector.

In light of this background in the related literature and the characteristics of the Turkish community in Flanders, this study is based on one broad hypothesis with three variables: we would expect to find significant differences regarding Turkish language use and attitudes towards Turkish among different generations, among people from different social status and gender.

1.3. Turkish as Mother Tongue Education in Flanders

At that point; it may be relevant to recall the education system in Belgium and to see the position of Turkish as in the manner of mother tongue education in Flanders. Belgium, as a federal state, gives each community to set up their own education system, so the Flemish government has its own education policy. The main schooling period is made up of two six-year periods for children from 6 to 12 and 12 to 18 consecutively. Also, for children from 2.5 to 6 years, nursery education is given. Though not

compulsory, high attendance into nursery schools is easy to observe by Flemish children. However, immigrant children's regular nursery school attendance is quite low. This may be considered as one of the potential reasons that these children are academically poor in the following years.

Turkey also takes into consideration Turkish citizens' maintenance of first language skills in Belgium. On the basis of a bilateral cultural agreement between Turkey and Belgium, Turkish language and culture teachers are appointed to Belgium for five-year period since 1997. In fact, this type of practice is available in most of the European countries such as France, Germany and Italy. In addition to this, Turkey appoints Turkish language specialists; instructors, to universities or colleges where Turkish is taught as a second language at an academic level. In the academic year of 2012-2013, in Flanders, there are 74 Turkish language and culture teachers and 2 instructors, one at Ghent University and one at Thomas Moore College in Antwerp. Also; in the same academic year, there are 6045 students of Turkish origin in 148 schools and 92 Turkish associations. These teachers and instructors are attached to the Educational Counselor of the Turkish Embassies; namely Turkish Embassy in Brussels. The Turkish language curriculum in these courses is prepared in line with the needs of the target group by teachers and the Educational Counselor. In the academic year of 2012-2013, a new book set targeted at Turkish students abroad started to be followed. The attendance into Turkish classes is primarily based on voluntary participation. Students of Turkish origin follow these courses after their formal school time, sometimes after around 16:00 in various Turkish associations in their neighborhood or sometimes in some Flemish public schools where mostly Turkish people are populated. However, the access to the school facilities has been quite limited after formal school hours or in some schools, teachers have not been allowed to make use of all facilities. The teaching-learning atmospheres can be also problematic in some Turkish associations as they were mostly built on religious purposes as mosques (all data taken from the Brussels Turkish Embassy, The Education Department, May, 2013).

2. Methodology

This study is a systematic investigation on the impact of intergenerational differences on the language attitudes, use and preference of Turkish minority group towards their host language in a specific administrative part of Belgium; namely, Flanders. We hypothesized that age, social class, birthplace and period of residence would be related to language attitudes of minority group; namely Turkish group in this study, towards Turkish as their minority language. As the main focus of this research is on genera-

tional differences, extending the definition of generation in earlier studies (Yagmur 2009, Yagmur and Akinci 2003) both age and birthplace have been considered as indicators of generation.

2.1. Participants

136 Turkish persons (37.6% male and 62.4% female) living in Flanders (particularly Ghent and Antwerp) for different time periods participated in the study. The respondents' living period in Flanders ranges from 2 years to 46, with the mean of 23.61 (see Table 4). 40.2% of the participants were between 15-24 years old and 59.8% of them were aged between 25-66. Inspired by Erikson and Goldthorpe's classification (1992), we distinguished between five main social-classes, i.e. (1) professionals, (2) the middle class, (3) the working class, (4) students, and (5) the unemployed (reference group). (See Table 3 for descriptives).

2.2. Measures

Two main questionnaires were used to collect data in this study as following Yagmur and van de Vijver. (2012): The Language Use, Choice and Preference Scale, including 50 questions in 5 subsections and The Attitudes to Turkish Language Scale, including 20 items. In the former, there were items related to the language register spoken with different interlocutors, such as mother, father, and siblings and language register spoken to respondent; language use; language preference; and language choice across topics. The respondents were supposed to reply to language use or choice questions in a bipolar format, for example: "In which language do you interact mostly with your father?" The responses were based on a 5-point bipolar answer format ranging from 'always Dutch' (1) to 'always Turkish' (5). In the latter, there were items designed to address attitudes toward Turkish language in various domains. The participants were asked to respond to each question regarding how strongly they valued Turkish language, for example, "How important is Turkish to find a job? and "How important is Turkish to rear children?" The scale of this part was based on a 5-point response format from not important (1) to very important (5). As shown in Table 3, all scales revealed a satisfactory Chronbach's alpha, ranging from 0.86 to 0.95.

2.3. Procedure

In line with the procedure by Yagmur and van de Vijver (2012), the questionnaires prepared in Turkish and Dutch were given to the respondents and they were told that they were free to choose any language in which they felt more expressive. The access to the Turkish community in Flanders was sometimes provided with the support of the Turkish Consulate in

Antwerp and some Turkish cultural organizations, but mostly with the researchers' individual efforts according to the target group's availability and willingness. Limited number of informants preferred internet and the electronic version of the questionnaires were sent to them. The questionnaires given to volunteers were filled in their personal free time, then they contacted the researchers to give the questionnaires back.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data analysis was made up of 3 phases. To examine the relationship between generation and language outcomes, both indicators of generation are taken into account, i.e. age group and country of birth. Firstly, we compared mean scores of the younger generation (16 to 25 years old) with the older generation (26 to 66 years old). Secondly, we compared respondents born in Turkey (first generation), with respondents born in Flanders (second generation). The significance of the differences was compared with ANOVA-tests (see Table 5). Thirdly, we examined the relationship between the two indicators of generation i.e. (age group and birth of country) and the language outcomes while taking account of the effects of other variables such as length of residence, gender and social class. This is done with multiple regression analysis (see Table 6). Missing variables were handled with multiple imputation; five imputations were requested.

Table 3. *Descriptive analysis: Number of respondents (N); means and standard deviations (SD) given for continuous variables; percentages (%) given for categorical variables; Chronbach's alpha given for scales*

	N	Mean or %	SD	Alpha
<i>Independent variables</i>				
Length of residence	132	23.61	10.67	
Age group				
15-24	53	40.2%		
25-66	79	59.8%		
Country of birth				
Belgium	75	55.6%		
Turkey	60	44.4%		
Gender				
Male	50	37.6%		
Female	83	62.4%		

Social Class				
Professional	34	25.0%		
Middle-class	30	22.1%		
Working-class	22	16.2%		
Students	27	19.9%		
Unemployed	23	16.9%		
<i>Dependent variables</i>				
R* speaks Turkish to others	136	4.07	0.64	0.86
Others speak Turkish to R*	136	4.00	0.73	0.85
Turkish use in daily practices	136	3.21	0.86	0.92
Turkish choice in emotions	135	3.58	0.85	0.95
Turkish choice across topics	135	3.38	0.81	0.92
Importance of Turkish	135	2.87	0.63	0.90
Attitudes towards Turkish	135	3.47	0.63	0.88

R* = respondent

3. Findings

3.1. Bivariate analysis

Differences with respect to age-group generation were presented in Table 4. The results indicated that there was no statistical significant difference between the younger and the older generation regarding the extent of speaking Turkish to others ($d = 0.18$; $F = 2.37$; $p = 0.13$), regarding the extent of Turkish spoken to the respondent ($d = 0.15$; $F = 1.29$; $p = 0.26$), regarding language choice in expressing emotions ($d = 0.15$; $F = 1.01$; $p = 0.32$), regarding language preference across various topics ($d = 0.17$; $F = 1.39$; $p = 0.24$), and regarding attitudes towards the Turkish language ($d = 0.07$; $F = 0.40$; $p = 0.53$). However, there was a statistically significant difference with respect to Turkish use in daily practices ($d = 0.32$; $F = 4.38$; $p = 0.04$). This finding indicated that older generations used more frequently the Turkish language than do the younger respondents during their daily practices such as reading, watching TV, thinking, counting, etc. There was also a statistically significant difference with respect to perceived importance of the Turkish language: the older respondents reported that Turkish was *less* important than do the younger generation ($d = -0.33$; $F = 9.07$; $p < 0.00$).

Table 4. *Analysis of variance (ANOVA): Differences between age group generations on language outcomes*

	15-24 year	25-66 year	Difference	F-test	P-value
R speaks Turkish to others	3.96	4.14	0.18	2.37	0.13
Others speak Turkish to R	3.90	4.05	0.15	1.29	0.26
Turkish use in daily practices	3.03	3.34	0.32	4.38	0.04
Turkish choice in emotions	3.49	3.64	0.15	1.01	0.32
Turkish choice across topics	3.28	3.45	0.17	1.39	0.24
Importance of Turkish	3.08	2.74	-0.33	9.07	0.00
Attitudes towards Turkish	3.42	3.49	0.07	0.40	0.53

Table 5 provides generational differences with respect to country of birth. The results clearly showed that the first generation (those born in Turkey) statistically differed from the second generation (those born in Flanders) with respect to *all* dependent variables. The second generation Flemish-Turks spoke less Turkish to others ($d = 0.46$; $F = 21.67$; $p = 0.00$), others spoke less Turkish to them ($d = 0.48$; $F = 17.55$; $p = 0.00$), they used less Turkish in their daily practices ($d = 0.89$; $F = 45.26$; $p = 0.00$), they preferred less Turkish across various emotions ($d = 0.72$; $F = 26.89$; $p = 0.00$), and they chose less Turkish when talking about various topics ($d = 0.62$; $F = 21.19$; $p = 0.00$), and they had more negative attitudes towards the Turkish language. Nevertheless, the second generation perceived the Turkish language as being more important than do the first generation ($d = -0.24$; $F = 6.55$; $p = 0.02$).

Table 5. *Analysis of variance (ANOVA): Differences between country of birth generations on language outcomes*

	Born in Belgium	Born in Turkey	Difference	F-test	P-value
R speaks Turkish to others	3.88	4.34	0.46	21.67	0.00
Others speak Turkish to R	3.80	4.28	0.48	17.55	0.00
Turkish use in daily practices	2.81	3.70	0.89	45.26	0.00
Turkish choice in emotions	3.25	3.98	0.72	26.89	0.00
Turkish choice across topics	3.11	3.73	0.62	21.19	0.00
Importance of Turkish	2.95	2.71	-0.24	6.55	0.02
Attitudes towards Turkish	3.33	3.63	0.30	7.16	0.01

3.2. Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 6 gives the results of the multiple regression analysis. With respect to the indicators of generation, the results showed that all bivariate age group differences (see above) became insignificant after controlling for other variables. However, the second indicator of generation, (i.e. country of birth) still exerted a significant effect on most outcomes: after controlling for other variables the first generation respondents (who are born in Turkey) spoke more often Turkish to others ($b = 0.28$; $p = 0.03$), others spoke more often Turkish to them ($b = 0.38$; $p = 0.01$), they used more Turkish in their daily practices ($b = 0.61$; $p = 0.00$), they preferred the Turkish language above Dutch across various emotions ($b = 0.46$; $p = 0.01$). However, their preference for Turkish when talking about various topics did not statistically differ from the second generation ($b = 0.25$; $p = 0.09$), neither did their attitudes towards the Turkish language ($b = 0.17$; $p = 0.18$). Still, net of other variables, the first generation perceived the Turkish language as being less important than do the second generation ($d = -0.41$; $F = 6.55$; $p = 0.00$; see Table 6).

The results make clear that after controlling for other variables *length of residence* is also significantly related on different outcomes. That is, respondents that were residing for more years in Flanders, used less Turkish during their daily practices ($b = -0.02$; $p = 0.03$), chose less Turkish across various emotions ($b = -0.02$; $p = 0.01$), chose less Turkish across various topics ($b = -0.02$; $p = 0.01$), perceived Turkish as being less important ($b = -0.01$; $p = 0.02$), and had more negative attitudes towards the Turkish language ($b = -0.01$; $p = 0.04$). However, holding other effects constant, length of stay was statistically unrelated to both the extent of speaking Turkish to others ($b = -0.01$; $p = 0.08$), and the extent to which others' spoke Turkish to the respondents ($b = -0.01$; $p = 0.27$).

Social class is clearly related to most language outcomes, except for the extent of Turkish spoken by others to the respondent and respondents' attitudes towards the Turkish language. For most outcomes, we saw a clear pattern in which respondents of higher social classes spoke less Turkish, preferred less the Turkish language across various topics and emotions, and they perceived the Turkish language as being less important.

It should be noted that *gender* is not statistically related to any language outcomes when we control for other outcomes.

Table 6. *Multivariate regression analysis: effects on language use outcomes (unstandardized beta coefficients are shown)*

	R speaks to others	Others speak to R	Daily practices	Emotions	Topics	Importance	Attitudes
Intercept	4.45***	4.17***	3.54***	4.14***	4.28***	3.69***	3.80***
Length of residence	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02*	-0.02**	-0.02**	-0.01**	-0.01*
Age group							
15-24	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
25-66	0.19	0.06	0.20	0.18	0.24	0.02	0.11
Country of birth							
Belgium	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)
Turkey	0.28*	0.38*	0.62***	0.47**	0.26	-0.41**	0.18
Gender							
Male	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)
Female	-0.11	-0.05	0.09	-0.02	-0.12	-0.05	0.08
Social Class							
Professional	-0.28	-0.10	-0.65***	-0.58**	-0.88***	-0.35*	-0.25
Middle-class	-0.51**	-0.29	-0.44*	-0.44*	-0.70***	-0.42**	-0.19
Working-class	-0.37*	-0.21	-0.31	-0.36	-0.56**	-0.35*	-0.34
Students	-0.29	-0.21	-0.50*	-0.40	-0.73***	-0.27	-0.27
Unemployed	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)	(ref)

Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

4. Results and Discussion

Following the accumulating research and discussions in the field, the priority of this paper was given to intergenerational differences as well as other components of ethnolinguistic vitality such as status and gender. According to Sachdev et al. (1987); changes in the perceptions and language behaviors between succeeding generations may indicate considerable implications and need to be investigated empirically. In our study, we considered age-group differences as generation and as a second indicator in the same variable, country of birth was taken into account. The results highlighted the difference between two generations (also those born in Turkey and born in

Flanders). The second generation tended to speak less Turkish in their daily routines in terms of all aspects but interestingly, their perception of Turkish language was more positive than the first generation. We claim that the second generation's less use of Turkish in their routine is not drastic. Because of the second generation's increasing Flemish language competence, they have started to use Flemish in a wider range of settings when compared to the first generation. This finding is in line with the perspective by Arends-Toth and van de Vijver (2004) about Turkish-Dutch's giving more importance to Turkish in their public domain such as education, language and social contacts in the Netherlands. Their negative approach to Turkish in their routines; however, may derive from the segregationists in the main stream society. Though this is the case, they still develop mild perception towards Turkish which is vis-à-vis a substantial body of research findings underlining that language is one of the most salient dimensions of group identity (e.g. Giles et al. 1977, Sachdev and Bourhis 1990). These findings of the study are also related to results by Yagmur et al. 2003. In their study, they also found that the second generation Turkish group in France employed more positive attitudes towards Turkish than the older generation. Similarly; Cemiloglu and Sen (2012) investigated Turkish children's (aged between 11-15) attitudes towards Turkish and found that the Turkish children developed positive attitudes towards Turkish. According to them, attitude is not an in-born factor. It emerges and develops in time in relation to life and experiences. It is also affected by media and environment, so second generation's preference of Flemish in Flanders and French in France more frequently than Turkish can be a good indicator of new generation's integration attempt into the receiving community. An influential and mild proposal regarding integration can be that adaptation or assimilation is not a one-way process but two-way interaction requiring respect, mutual understanding and active participation on the behalf of both the mainstream community members and immigrants (Wets 2006). Therefore, second generation Turks seem to be actively engaged in this integration process through language component. At the same time, their positive attitude development towards Turkish can be regarded as sign of their high vitality perception of their ethnic culture, which is quite parallel to Turkish group in France (Yagmur and Akinci 2003) and in the Netherlands (Yagmur et al. 1999). With the framework of Giles et al.'s ethnolinguistic vitality theory (1977), mother tongue of immigrant communities has been a crucial factor to be retained as an indicator of high ethnolinguistic vitality. To some extent, this mild tendency by the second generation may stem from the support given by the Turkish government about mother tongue classes through

Turkish teachers sent by the Ministry of Turkish National Education. In a study by Cemiloglu and Sen (2012), it was seen that the students attending Turkish classes at weekends or out-of-school hours developed more positive attitudes towards Turkish. Similar to France context, the findings in our study showed that Turkish was spoken by the first generation particularly in the domestic domain owing to in-group marriages and close contact among Turkish community (Quention 2013).

With regard to social class, the results did not seem so striking. Turkish people from high social class tended to speak less Turkish as they had all received formal education in Dutch and they had more prestigious occupations in the mainstream society, they may have felt themselves more expressive through Dutch and also to receive more acceptance by the Flemish community. As they did not face any language problems in the society, it can be regarded quite normal that they perceived Turkish language as less important. Status-related factors as well as language and culture are significant determinants on an ethnolinguistic group's social prestige, its economic and socio-historical status (Sacdev 1995). In Belgium parliament, there have been a number of very active politicians recently, which can be potentially important on Turkish people's ethnolinguistic vitality.

4. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate Turkish immigrants' attitudes towards their heritage language and their language use-choice with particular emphasis on Flanders. Recent research addressed Turks as the biggest immigrant group in Europe from different aspects. After Germany, in Belgium, Turks will have been living for fifty years in the next days. This migration process of Turkish people into Europe has been the concern from various aspects in academic studies (Kaya et al. 2008). Also, some administrative institutions are organizing summative research about Turkish people's presence in Europe for fifty years. For example, Centre for Equal Opportunities and Opposition to Racism in Brussels has just launched its 2012 performance report in which there is a special part about migration (Quention 2013). In this report, a project was introduced about the analysis of migratory flows in 2012, with specific reference to Turkey. This project is about demographic study of the population of Turkish origin in Belgium. The Centre wanted to shed light on the way the population of Turkish origin has developed in Belgium. In the framework of the agreement between the Centre in Brussels and the Centre for Research on Demography and Societies, a demographic analysis of the population of Turkish origin was carried out in Belgium. This study places the emphasis on

where this population is to be found on Belgian soil and the way its demographic characteristics have evolved.

In recent years, the importance of language proficiency in both home and host language has been regarded as a complementary element of social acceptance into the host community. There is a slight tendency in the mainstream society to regard immigrants' first language as a linguistic diversity, not as a deficit, so social harmony between both cultural groups will be positively developed - though still empirical studies do not present supportive findings.

Turkish group in Flanders can be regarded as lucky since they are at the heart of Europe and they have quite easy and rich access to all Turkish media, TV channels through satellites and a plenty of Turkish seminars, talks and conferences about different aspects of Turkey or Turkish language. Turkish is taught at an academic level in Flanders at Ghent University College since 2006 as a second language and for Turkish-origin children, Turkish classes are given outside school hours through the collaboration between Belgium and Turkey.

We need to move beyond our study into the French speaking community of Belgium, then compare these two parts, and to reflect the general picture of Belgium in terms of immigrant groups' minority language perspectives.

In recent years; studies in similar trends are in accumulation in the field in Europe. In the past, sociolinguistic research area was in lack of studies in Europe as most studies were carried out in Canada, the USA or Australia. However; among the studies related to acculturation, immigrants' language use, language policies etc., we strongly claim that Belgium should be given utmost attention owing to its own compact administrative system. What seems available and applicable in the Flemish community may not be the right implication for the French community as each has its own social, education and language policy. Therefore, each community in Belgium should firstly be investigated in itself, in the way that this study has concentrated, and then, the views from both communities should be integrated in order to get an overall picture of Belgium.

References

- Agirdag, Orhan (2010). "Exploring bilingualism in a monolingual school system: insights from Turkish and native students from Belgian schools". *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 31 (3): 307-321.
- Agirdag, Orhan, Piet van Avermaet and Mieke van Houtte (2013). "School Segregation and Math Achievement: A Mixed-Method Study on the Role of Self-Fulfilling Prophecies". *Teachers College Record* 115 (3): 1-50.

- Akinci, Mehmet Ali (2008). "Language use and biliteracy practices of Turkish speaking children and adolescents in France". *Multilingualism and Identities across Contexts: Cross Disciplinary Perspectives on Turkish-speaking Youth in Europe*. Ed. Lytra, V & Jorgenson, J. Copenhagen University Press. 45, 85-108.
- Akinci, Mehmet Ali and Nathalie Decool-Mercier (2010). "Aspects of language acquisition and disorders in Turkish-French bilingual children". *Communication disorders in Turkish in monolingual and multilingual settings*. Ed. S. Topbaş & M. Yavaş. 314-353.
- Arends-Tóth, Judith and Fons J.R. van de Vijver (2003). "Multiculturalism and acculturation: views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch". *European Journal of Social Psychology* 33 (2): 249-266.
- _____, (2004). "Domains and dimensions in acculturation: Implicit theories of Turkish-Dutch". *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 28: 19-35.
- Backus, Ad (2004). "Convergence as a mechanism of language change". *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 7 (2): 179-181.
- Backus Ad and Hanneke van der Heijden (1998). "Life and birth of a bilingual: the mixed code of bilingual children and adults in the Turkish community in the Netherlands". *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Ed. L. Johanson. August 3-6. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 527-55.
- _____, (2002). "Language mixing by young Turkish children in the Netherlands". *Psychology of Language and Communication* 6 (1): 55-73.
- Berry, John W and Rudolf Kalin (1995). "Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 National Survey". *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* 27 (3): 301.
- Blommaert, Jan, L. Creve and Evita Willaert (2006). "On Being Declared Illiterate: Language-Ideological Disqualification in Dutch Classes for Immigrants in Belgium". *Language & Communication* 26 (1): 34-54.
- Bollen, Katrien and Kristof Baten (2010). "Bilingual Education in Flanders: Policy and Press Debate (1999–2006)". *The Modern Language Journal* 94 (3): 412-433.
- Bourhis, Richard Yvon, Howard Giles and Doreen Rosenthal (1981). "Notes on the construction of a "Subjective Vitality Questionnaire" for ethnolinguistic groups". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2: 144-155.
- Cemiloglu, İsmet and Ulker Sen (2012). "The Attitudes of Turkish Children Who Live in Belgium towards Turkish in terms of Demographical Features". *Journal of World of Turks* 4(2): 7-26.

- Erikson, Robert and John H. Goldthorpe (1992). *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Giles, Howard, Doreen Rosenthal and Louis Young (1977). "Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations". *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. Ed. H. Giles. London: Academic Press.
- Huls, Erica (2000). "Power in Turkish Migrant Families". *Discourse and Society* 11(3): 345-372.
- Jacobs, Dirk and Andrea Rea (2006). "Construction and Import of Ethnic Categorisations: "Allochtones" in the Netherlands and Belgium". Paper prepared for the EURODIV conference 26-27 Jan. Milano.
- Johnson, Patricia, Howard Giles and Richard Yvon Bourhis (1983). "The Viability of Ethnolinguistic Vitality: A Reply". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 4: 255-269.
- Kaya, Ayhan and Ferhat Kentel (2008). *Belçika Türkleri: Türkiye ile Avrupa Birliği Arasında Köprü mü Engel mi?* İstanbul Bilgi University Publications.
- Kauschke, Christina, Hae-Wook Lee and Soyeong Pae (2007). "Similarities and Variation in noun and verb acquisition a crosslinguistic study of children learning German, Korean and Turkish". *Language and Cognitive Processes* 22: 1-28.
- Kipp, Sandra, Michael Clyne and Anne Pauwels (1995). *Immigration and Australia's Language Resources*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Manco, Altay (2000). "Belçika'da Türklerin 40 yılı (1960-2000): Sorunlar, Gelişmeler, Değişmeler". *Muğla University, Journal of Social Sciences* 1(1): 119-133.
- Manco, Altay (2002). "Göçmen Türklerin Belçika Eğitim Sisteminde Yeri". *C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 26 (1): 61-68.
- Pfaff, Carol (1994). "Early bilingual development of Turkish children in Berlin". *Crosslinguistic study of bilingual development*. Ed. G. Extra and L. Verhoeven. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Phalet, Karen, Claudia van Lotringen and Han Entzinger (2000). *Islam in de multiculturele samenleving*. Utrecht: ERCOMER.
- Quentin, Schoonvaere (2013). *Demografische Studie over de Populatie van Turkse Herkomst in België*. Report presented by Centrum voor Gelijheid van Kansen en voor Racismebestrijding, Brussels.
- Reitz, Jeffrey G. (1980). *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Sachdev, Itesh (1995). "Language and Identity: Ethnolinguistic Vitality of Aboriginal Peoples in Canada". *The London Journal of Canadian Studies* 11: 41-59.

- Sachdev, Itesh and Richard Bourhis (1990). "Language and Social Identification". *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and critical advances*. Ed. D. Abrams and M. Hogg. Harvester-Wheatsheaf. 101-124.
- Sachdev, Itesh, Richard Bourhis, Sue-wen Phang and John D'Eye (1987). "Language Attitudes and Vitality Perceptions: Intergenerational Effects amongst Chinese Canadian Communities". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 6: 287-307.
- Sam, David L. and John W. Berry (2006). *Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology*. Ed. S. L. David and J.W. Berry. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Yagmur, Kutlay (2004). "Language maintenance patterns of Turkish immigrant communities in Australia and Western Europe: The impact of majority attitudes on ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 165: 121-42.
- _____, (2010a). "Evaluation of Turkish teaching within the language policy framework of Western Europe". *Journal of Social Sciences in the Turkish World* 55 (10): 221-241.
- _____, (2010b). "The role of national and ethnic media in the escalation of socio-cultural conflict". *Languages et Littératures* 20: 169-191.
- Yagmur, Kutlay and Fons J.R. van de Vijver (2012). "Acculturation and Language Orientations of Turkish Immigrants in Australia, France, Germany and the Netherlands". *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 43 (7): 1110-1130.
- Yagmur, Kutlay, Kees De Bot and Hubert Korzilius (1999). "Language Attrition, Language Shift and Ethnolinguistic Vitality of Turkish in Australia". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 20 (1): 51-69.
- Yagmur, Kutlay and Mehmet Ali Akinci (2003). "Language use, choice, maintenance and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish speakers in France: Intergenerational differences". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 164: 107-128.
- Wets, Johan (2006). "The Turkish Community in Austria and Belgium: The Challenge of Integration". *Turkish Studies* 7 (1): 85-100. <http://statbel.fgov.be/nl/statistieken/cijfers/> [Access date: May 05, 2013]

Flaman Bölgesi'ndeki Türkçe Konuşurlarının Dil Kullanımı ve Dil Tutumlarına Yönelik Belirleyiciler: Nesil Farklılıkları Odaklı Bir Çalışma

N. Feyza Altıncamış*

Orhan Ağırdağ**

Öz

Bu araştırma, Belçika'nın Flaman Bölgesi'nde yaşayan göçmen Türklerin ana dilleri Türkçeye karşı olan tutum, tercih ve kullarımlarını nesiller arası farkı dikkate alarak incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Alanda önde gelen çalışmalardan biri olan Yağmur ve van de Vijfer (2012) tarafından yapılan araştırma model alınarak, 136 katılımcıya "Dil Kullanımı ve Tercih Ölçeği" ve "Türkçeye Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği" verilmiştir. Nesil, sosyal statü, doğum yeri ve cinsiyet faktörlerinin Türkçeye yönelik tutum üzerinde etkili olabileceği varsayımlarından hareketle, bu faktörler araştırmada bağımsız değişkenler olarak ele alınmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları nesil değişkeni ile beraber yabancı ülkede geçirilen süre değişkeninin bazı değişkenlerle anlamlı olarak ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca, sonuçlar, sosyal statünün de anlamlı bir şekilde katılımcıların Türkçeye yönelik tutumları üzerinde etkili olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Çalışmada, cinsiyet faktörünün dile yönelik hiçbir değişken ile bağlantısı olmadığı görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Dil tutumları, azınlık dili olarak Türkçe, Flaman Bölgesi, dil kullanımı ve dil tercihi

* Dr., Ghent Üniversitesi, Sanat ve Felsefe Fakültesi, Mütercim Tercümanlık ve İletişim Bölümü, Türkçe Programı – Ghent / Belçika ve Çukurova Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu – Adana / Türkiye
feyza.altincamis@ugent.be

** Yrd. Doç. Dr., Amsterdam Üniversitesi, Çocuk Gelişimi ve Eğitimi Araştırma Enstitüsü – Amsterdam / Hollanda
orhan.agirdag@gmail.com

Определяющие использования языка и отношения к языкам среди турецкоговорящего населения Фландрии: исследование различий между поколениями

Н. Фейза Алтынкамыш*

Орхан Агырдаг **

Аннотация

Эта работа призвана исследовать отношение турецких мигрантов, проживающих во Фламандском регионе Бельгии, к своему родному турецкому языку, языковые предпочтения и использование языка, учитывая различия между различными поколениями. Используя в качестве модели одну из ведущих работ в данной области - исследование Ягмур и ван де Вижфер (2012), 136 участникам были даны «измерения использования языка и языковых предпочтений» и «измерение отношения к турецкому языку». Истекая из возможности влияния таких факторов, как поколение, социальный статус, место рождения и пол на отношение к турецкому языку, эти факторы были рассмотрены в исследовании как независимые переменные. Результаты исследования показывают, что переменная поколения вместе с переменной времени, проведенного в зарубежной стране значительно взаимосвязаны с некоторыми из переменных. Кроме того, результаты указывают, что социальный статус значительно влияет на отношение к турецкому языку. Работа показывает, что половая принадлежность никак не связана с языковыми переменными.

Ключевые слова

отношение к языку, турецкий язык как язык меньшинства, Фландрия, использование языка и языковые предпочтения

* док. Гентский университет кафедра перевода, интерпретации и коммуникации - Гент / Бельгия и университет Чукурова, высшая школа иностранных языков – Адана / Турция
feyza.altinkamis@ugent.be

** доц.док. Амстердамский университет, научно-исследовательский институт детского развития и образования – Амстердам / Нидерланды
orhan.Agirdag@gmail.com