Kutlay Yagmur
Fons J. R. van de Vijver

Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Acculturation in Turkish Immigrants

Identity, Language and Education Across Generations

Springer

Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Acculturation in Turkish Immigrants

Kutlay Yagmur · Fons J. R. van de Vijver

Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Acculturation in Turkish Immigrants

Identity, Language and Education Across Generations

Springer

Kutlay Yagmur 🆔
Tilburg University, School of Humanities
and Digital Sciences
Tilburg, Noord-Brabant, The Netherlands

Fons J. R. van de Vijver 🆔
Tilburg University, School of Humanities
and Digital Sciences
Tilburg, Noord-Brabant, The Netherlands

Preface

This book is more than a product of laborious research process for me. It both honours a long-time friendship and serves as a remembrance to an inspiring scholar in cross-cultural psychology, Fons van de Vijver. I taught and conducted research together with Fons van de Vijver at Tilburg University, the Netherlands. He had been an inspiration for me to dive into the ocean of acculturation research. As a sociolinguist, I looked at social life and its problems from a very different angle. I expressed my criticisms over the traditional methodologies used in acculturation research. Being very receptive and reflective, Fons always listened very carefully and appreciated the outlook of a sociolinguist. Realizing the benefits of interdisciplinary research, we both committed ourselves to new research projects on socio-cultural and linguistic adaptation of immigrants in various national contexts. We supervised PhD and post-doctoral projects together. Some of the outcomes of those projects are synthesized in this book. We are grateful to our young researchers for cooperating with us in different projects. Without the wonderful collaboration of Serkan Arikan, Irem Bezcioglu-Goktolga, Gozde Demirel and Tulay Et-Bozkurt, this project has been incomplete.

Many books have their own stories. Next to its insightful and rich synthesis, this book has a sad story. Fons and I submitted a panel proposal to biannual Symposium of International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology in Guelph, Canada in 2018. The title of our panel was "Acculturation, Language Maintenance and Family Language Policy Practices of Turkish speakers in Australia, France, Germany and the Netherlands". The above-mentioned young scholars were part of that panel as well. Before the conference took place, I received an exciting e-mail from Ms. Shinjini Chaterjee of Springer publishing house expressing interest in our panel. As a scholar, you do not always get a mail about your presentation at an international conference. Springer publishing house apparently had a keen interest in the field. Ms. Shinjini Chaterjee reflected on our panel very closely and found the topics highly relevant and innovative for our field of study. She came to our panel and listened to the presentations very carefully. Afterwards, we discussed the possibility of turning the subject matter of this panel into a full-fledged book for a wider readership. Immediately after the Conference, Fons and I worked on our book proposal for the

Springer. The proposal was accepted and we chose the deadline as 30 October 2019. In the meanwhile, Fons retired and moved to Queensland, Australia. He continued working on the unfinished Ph.D. projects and a number of paper publications with a number of colleagues. In order to finalize our Book, I took a sabbatical to work on our book uninterruptedly. I Skyped with Fons about the structure and work division of our chapters. We agreed on the deadlines for submitting the individual chapters to each other so that we would deliver our book in time to Springer. It was only after 10 days that we spoke; I got a Skype call from Fons van de Vijver. Because Fons always used to make appointments per e-mail before calling, seeing the unannounced Skype call, I knew something was wrong. When I saw the face of the caller, I panicked. It was Fons' wife Lona. She told us that Fons passed away on that morning (1st of June 2019). Knowing the healthy lifestyle and perfect condition of my Friend, I could not believe my ears. He had a heavy brain haemorrhage; it was not possible to save him. The sudden loss of our beloved Friend was the cause of an extended period of still-stand in academic life for me. Fons had contributed immensely to the academia. He had published innumerable articles and books. He had supervised many numbers of projects. He had worked very hard all his life. Ten months after his retirement, he lost his life. I found the master plan of life extremely unfair. Regaining my energy and finding inspiration to battle further was difficult.

It was impossible to meet the deadline of 30 October because we had not even started our book. We only had the detailed book proposal. I informed Ms. Shinjini Chaterjee of the Springer to ask for a year's extension. They were very understanding. Springer had a long history of cooperation with Fons van de Vijver. I had to make the decision to write the manuscript on my own and publish it in our names. I owed this last gesture to my dear Friend. We had worked together on a number of joint projects. We had large amount of data to be utilized for this book. Now it was my responsibility to finalize the manuscript to honour my colleague.

When all was going fine again, COVID-19 hit all of us. Due to the pandemic, universities locked down. We all had to find new ways of teaching and testing. Many projects were on hold. The psychological uncertainties and new forms of teaching undermined our life and work. I had another serious test case blocking the writing of our manuscript. Yet, the determination to honour my colleague was stronger than all other considerations. We had some excellent data and our joint synthesis had to meet the academia. With this persuasion, I undertook my writing task, the outcome of which is presented in this book.

I dedicate this book to my beloved colleague Fons van de Vijver, who inspired many young and senior scholars all around the Globe.

Tilburg, The Netherlands   Kutlay Yagmur

Contents

Chapter 1
Introducing 'Acculturation and Language in a Multidisciplinary Perspective'

This book presents a synthesis of findings from a number of different research projects on language maintenance and shift, acculturation orientations, family language policy, school achievement and bilingualism in Turkish speaking communities in different immigration contexts. By using empirical evidence in five immigration countries, the impact of assimilation, integration and diversity policies on Turkish immigrants' acculturation orientations are discussed. Language maintenance and shift constitute the overall conceptual framework of the book. Michael Clyne's (1991, 2003) and Joshua Fishman's (1991) extensive work on language maintenance and shift in immigrant and indigenous communities have shown that the family is a crucial site of language maintenance. When the parents and the overall language community consider heritage language as a core value (Smolicz, 1981), language maintenance is more sustainable. The family remains for most immigrant groups and their younger generations the main domain for heritage language use and development (Pauwels, 2005). Given the importance of family language practices, parental choices and strategies in language maintenance receive extensive attention in this Book. Parental choices have an impact on language development of immigrant children. Some parents choose not to transmit their heritage language to younger generations; while other parents prefer bilingual upbringing, which has implications for the school achievement of children from an immigration heritage.

Traditional approaches to language maintenance/shift and acculturation focus on the ethnic group as the object of language contact research. Ethnic groups consist of individuals with different social, cultural, educational and linguistic characteristics. Members of ethnic groups are also the members of the mainstream community. For instance, a Turkish-Dutch speaking bilingual person is connected with both Turkish and Dutch communities. The sense of belonging and self-identification of every Turkish-Dutch bilingual might be different from each other. Individuals construct their identities in interaction with others. A first-generation Turkish speaker usually has less skills in Dutch and better skills in Turkish, which inevitably leads him/her to connect more with Turkish speakers in the immigration context. This does not mean

that his/her acculturation orientations are less positive regarding the Dutch culture and society.

Language use and acculturation cannot be effectively examined in the absence of contextual circumstances. Linguistic practices and sociocultural integration of individuals need to be investigated in connection with their relationship to their families, ethnic communities and to the mainstream community. Instead of presenting the findings of isolated studies on a single aspect of language maintenance or acculturation, this book presents the synthesis derived from multiple studies on the same community in various immigration contexts.

1.1 Acculturation Framework

Acculturation studies incorporate new methodological approaches in researching language maintenance and shift of immigrant minority languages. This book deals with identity, language and acculturation by combining psychological, sociolinguistic and ethnographic perspectives by providing a multidisciplinary perspective on Turkish immigrants living in Australia, France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United States of America. The primary focus is on the European and Australian context. In order to show the relationship between receiving society policies and immigrant group characteristics, a profile of Turkish immigrant communities abroad is presented in Chap. 2. After an overview of the dominant theoretical acculturation and sociolinguistic models in the field (Chap. 3), the subsequent chapters describe recent qualitative and quantitative studies on this topic and draws on decades of research by the authors. We explore differences and similarities in acculturation of Turkish speakers across mentioned countries and link the differences to contextual characteristics, such as community characteristics, immigration climate and education.

In researching socio-cultural and linguistic integration of immigrants, cross-cultural psychologists use acculturation framework; whereas, sociolinguists use language maintenance and shift framework. The focus of acculturation research is basically psychological characteristics of immigrant individuals who are experiencing acculturation. This is not to simplify a very complex field of study. Over the years, acculturation studies diversified tremendously. As discussed by Van de Vijver et al. (2016) the diversification of the field has added to the complexity of the issues in acculturation research. In this book, we exemplify the complexity by reflecting on the factors impinging upon socio-cultural, psychological and linguistic integration of Turkish speakers in multiple countries by using evidence from the conceptual framework of language maintenance and shift (Edwards, 1992; Fishman, 1991). We approach language maintenance and acculturation issues from an interdisciplinary perspective, drawing primarily on sociolinguistics but also on related disciplines such as education, psychology, and sociology.

We take a critical stand in examining the factors involved in socio-cultural adaptation of immigrants to their new cultural contexts. Linguistic and cultural contacts

result in complex socio-cultural changes in the immigrants and mainstream individuals who are in contact with the 'newcomers'. Multi-layered and highly complex nature of cultural adaptation requires multiplicity of factors be taken into consideration. In order to investigate long-term adaptations of immigrants, individual psychological factors and the cultural group level factors need to be examined. In other words, factors involved in acculturation conditions, orientations and outcomes should be investigated interdependently. Berry (1997) suggests four possible acculturation outcomes of immigrant adaptation. Bringing these complex social and cultural adaptation processes down to four types of responses as *assimilation, integration, separation* and *marginalization* would be too narrow and limiting. Even if we ignore the complexity of cultural contact processes and accept 'culture' as a homogenous entity, applying Berry's model to different generations of immigrants would be problematic. Individuals are socialized in different ways but cultural upbringing is not only confined to the family. When an individual is growing up, there are multiple factors that affect the socialisation and cultural forming of that individual. Neighbours, friends, family members, peer groups at school or in sport clubs, teachers, school textbooks, the media and so on have a considerable impact on an individual's socialization. Considering the cultural habits, there are multiple agents that transmit the norms and values of the larger collective entity to the individual. Young people with an immigration heritage born in the country of immigration are exposed to these different agents and institutions. In many cases, the so-called second-generation speaks the mainstream language much better than their parents' heritage language and socio-culturally they function much better in the immigration context compared to their parents' heritage country. Nevertheless, irrespective of their socio-cultural competence and linguistic skills in the host language and culture, researchers employ Berry's (1997) acculturation model in investigating acculturation of the second- and subsequent generations. As shown by research, the cultural orientations and acculturation processes of first and second generations differ considerably (see for instance, Yagmur, 2016). It is much easier for the second-generation immigrants to learn the societal language than their parents do. Because they attend mainstream schools and socialize with mainstream peers, they are more exposed to the host culture and their norms and values are more similar to the host group (Birman, 2006).

Most research on acculturation is based on rigid categories of group membership. The researchers have deeply entrenched views on mainstream identity, national belonging, language use, ancestry, kinship, religion, and ethnicity (Rudmin et al., 2017). Some researchers hold on to the idea of bounded ethnic communities and fixed categories of belonging and identity. As shown by Wimmer (2009), the socio-cultural reality of super diverse societies challenges narrow ideas of belonging and ethnic identification. Individuals construct their identities in interaction with relevant others in their social networks. Depending on the contextual circumstances and the individuals they interact with, they develop their communicative strategies. Based on four simple questions on language skills (e.g., How well do you understand languages *X* and *Y*? or How well do you read languages *X* and *Y*?), some acculturation researchers make huge over-generalisations (see, for instance, Vedder & Virta, 2005) over the linguistic integration of young people with an immigration heritage. Most

research ignores the dynamic nature of language use and identity construction, which are influenced by contextual factors. 'Ethnic minorities' are treated as fixed categories in space and time. The complex nature of language use and ethnic identification are ignored. State ideologies, institutional practices and acculturation orientations in the mainstream society impose and maintain hardened group boundaries.

Sociolinguistics deals with practices surrounding language use, choice and attitudes. Language maintenance and shift received increased attention from sociolinguists. Traditionally, cross-cultural psychologists deal with acculturation and cultural change but the limited focus on language in the process of cultural adaption has been a major limitation of acculturation studies. Even though the language of a group carries its cultural values and displays social practices, it receives very little attention in acculturation studies. Keeping in mind the limitations of existing acculturation models, especially regarding language use, choice and attitudes, there is extensive focus on language use and choice of Turkish immigrants across generations in multiple national contexts in this Volume.

By means of large scale and in-depth studies on language practices and acculturation orientations of Turkish immigrants in five different countries, the readers are presented with a coherent synthesis reflecting various conceptual dimensions in this book. Based on a cross-national study on language maintenance and acculturation orientations of Turkish speakers, a critical examination of sociocultural adaptation of first and second-generation Turkish immigrants are documented. The cross-national and cross-sectional design of this large-scale study gives the opportunity to examine the impact of receiving society integration ideologies on acculturation orientations of immigrant groups. Chapter 3 presents the synthesis of acculturation orientations of Turkish speakers in the larger framework of interactive acculturation theory (Bourhis et al., 1997) and language maintenance/shift.

1.2 Language Maintenance and Family Language Policy

Traditionally, language maintenance and shift studies examine the ongoing language change in groups; while acculturation focuses on the cultural and psychological changes taking place in individuals and in groups. Especially when we reflect on the group dynamics, intergroup relations and language use, it is inevitable that we focus on both dimensions. Sociolinguistic studies have examined the linguistic consequences of immigration. Language maintenance or shift emerges because of language contact. The type of interaction between the majority and minority language speakers influences the linguistic outcome. There are a number of models in the sociolinguistic literature for the investigation of language maintenance and shift as documented by Clyne (1991). Models developed by Edwards (1992), Giles et al. (1977), and Smolicz (1981), identify various factors that are important in language maintenance (or shift). Kipp et al. (1995) divided these factors into two related categories as factors affecting a speech community and factors affecting individuals within a speech community. Group factors include the size and distribution of an ethnic group, the policy of the

host community towards minority languages, the position of the language within the cultural value system of the group, and the proximity or distance of the minority language to or from the majority language. Birthplace, age, period of residence, gender, education, marriage patterns, prior knowledge of majority language, reason for migration, and language variety are considered to be individual factors (Kipp et al., 1995, p. 123). We might add factors at the individual level such as language choice and socialisation patterns, the interaction of which varies quite fundamentally across linguistic contexts. Different speech communities or individuals can behave in different ways under similar circumstances.

Language use, choice, preference and language attitudes are part of the language maintenance and shift framework. However, given the increased focus on the immigrant families and their language practices in the home and related domains, Family Language Policy (FLP) emerged as flourishing field of study. Research on FLP has gone through a number of phases in the last two decades (Lanza & Gomes, 2020) from a focus on language acquisition of children to a more sociolinguistic focus on conditions of language socialisation. Most FLP studies focused on the heritage language transmission practices of minority speakers. Parental strategies in transmitting their heritage language to younger generations is important for bilingual language acquisition, for schooling, for ethnic identification and so forth. Research on family language policy addresses a multitude of factors ranging from language acquisition, parental language ideologies, identity construction to language practices and management. Based on research evidence derived from two diverse national contexts (Australia and the Netherlands), family language policy practices and strategies of bilingual Turkish parents are critically examined in Chap. 4.

1.3   Educational Achievement

The relationship between school achievement and acculturation orientations has been investigated extensively in the European context. Most recently Phalet and Baysu (2020) documented widening achievement gaps between majority and minority youth by comparing the school careers of local-born Turkish and Moroccan minorities and the mainstream youth in seven European cities. Based on a comprehensive review of multiple studies, Phalet and Baysu reported that "across multiple data sources and intergroup settings discrimination experiences were revealed to be chronic sources of identity threat undermining minority inclusion and success" (2020, p. 17). As shown by earlier research, the school environment seriously impacts academic success or failure of students from an immigration heritage (Schachner et al., 2018). Schools that pay attention to the inclusion of minority students are more conducive to school success of pupils from a minority group.

Nevertheless, school achievement is a complex and multi-layered topic. Lower school achievement among immigrant minority children is a serious problem in most European countries. Factors leading to underachievement at school are multifaceted and interrelated. In the literature on bilingualism and school success, individual

characteristics such as cognitive skills, motivation and so forth of minority students are shown to be one of the most influential on school failure. In restrictive school environments, where mother tongues of minority children are ignored or prohibited, cognitive skills of immigrant minority students do not develop sufficiently compared to mainstream children. If a child's home language is undervalued or banned on the school ground, identity development might also be hampered. As a result, lower self-esteem among minority students might lead to lower school achievement. Due to segregated schools, there is insufficient exposure to the majority language which might in turn lead to inadequate proficiency in the mainstream language. It is also common knowledge that there are gaps between home and school culture due to different socialization patterns, which might also have an effect on school achievement of immigrant children. Most first-generation immigrant parents are known to be less proficient in the mainstream language, which leads to restrictions in parental involvement. If schools want to improve school achievement of immigrant children, old-fashioned submersion models need to be dropped. By employing teachers and support personnel from linguistic minority backgrounds schools could support first and second language development of immigrant children. The development of first language skills of immigrant children have been underestimated in many immigration countries. Comparison of immigrant and mainstream students showed large differences but which factors lead to such outcomes has not been researched in any detail. The majority of studies on educational inequalities take a rather static approach by focusing on educational outcomes at one point in time rather than analysing the school career as a whole (Baysu & de Valk, 2012).

PISA results of European nation-states caused intensive discussions regarding the share of immigrant children in low national scores of Austria and Germany. As reported by McNamara (2011, p. 437) "The PISA reports explicitly link the "poor" national performance of Austria to the presence of minority language students and constructs the multilingualism of immigrant students as a problem requiring remediation." German and Austrian policy makers complained the most about the influence of immigrant pupils for lowering the national scores; however, these countries have highly stratified school systems, which is detrimental to immigrant children's school achievement. The term stratification refers to the degree to which educational systems have clearly differentiated types of schools whose curricula are defined as 'higher' or 'lower'. One typical feature of highly stratified school systems is early tracking; i.e., separating pupils into different school tracks (Griga & Hadjar, 2014). By examining immigrant students' access rates to higher education institutions in countries with high and low stratified school systems, Griga and Hadjar (2014) concluded that a highly stratified secondary school system—as it is prevalent in many conservative immigration regimes (e.g., Austria, Germany)—reduces immigrant students' chances of attaining a higher education degree. There are multiple reasons for lower school achievement among immigrant children such as skills in the national language, socioeconomic status of parents, educational qualifications of the parents, school environment, lack of bilingual support systems in the schools and so forth.

Based on our earlier research, we aim at documenting the complicated nature of school achievement by analysing the data from different sources in this book. PISA

results are simply the outcomes of a very complicated schooling process. Language is at the basis of all types of learning. If immigrant children cannot achieve a certain level in the societal language, they are most likely to perform much less compared to mainstream students. As shown by many linguistic studies, there is a close correlation between second and first language skills of immigrants. If the first language skills are underdeveloped, the skills in L2 are similarly underdeveloped (Leseman, 2000; Verhoeven, 1994). In order to show this complicated relationship between L1 and L2 skills, we include Turkish speakers both from different immigration countries as well as from Turkey. Turkish speakers growing up in Turkey are mostly monolingual. They grow up in an environment where Turkish is the dominant societal language. However, immigrant children grow up in submersion environments where another language is the dominant societal language. They learn mainstream language as a second language. In order to see the effect of first and second language environments on Turkish speakers, available informants from PISA 2009 and 2012 samples are included in our analyses. As discussed in Chap. 5 and also Chap. 6, school achievement of immigrant children is a very complex topic. In Chap. 5, we discuss the role of language in school achievement by using PISA reading and mathematics scores of Turkish immigrants in Austria, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland and Netherlands. In the same chapter, we examine the role of bias and various measures related to immigrant integration policies of the host societies. Our multilevel analyses for reading and mathematics tests demonstrated that at individual level, students with higher scores on an index of economic, social, and cultural status obtained higher achievement scores. At country level, Migrant Integration Index (MIPEX) scores of education, general integration, and anti-discrimination measures of participating countries could predict differences in reading results but not in mathematics. We argue that this marked difference could be due to language factors, notably the lack of effective bilingual skills. We search for the link between first and second language skills to show its impact on school achievement.

As documented in Chap. 6, lower skills in the first language lead to lower skills in the societal language. By using empirical evidence derived from a bilingual test of reading in Dutch-Turkish, French-Turkish and German-Turkish from 10 years-old (N = 598) and 15 years-old (N = 518) Turkish immigrant children growing up in the Netherlands, France and Germany, Chap. 6 discusses the claimed link between first and second language skills of Turkish bilingual children. By using international testing programs, PIRLS & PISA tests, we tested the reading proficiency of 10 and 15 years-old Turkish immigrant children. The linguistic interdependence hypothesis of Jim Cummins (1979) is tested for the first time in these countries in two different age groups with students from a Turkish immigrant heritage. The findings partially support Cummins' hypothesis, that the level of the second language competence of a bilingual child is indeed partially a function of the type of competence the child has already developed in the first language. However, given the huge diversity in linguistic profiles of immigrant children, over-generalizations should be avoided. As shown in Chap. 6, significant differences between the national contexts show the possible effects of integration policies on the cognitive outcomes of acculturation.