



A content analysis of survey responses regarding language attitudes towards Turkish-German bilingualism

Wendy C Kempzell Jacinto

This paper investigates attitudes about Turkish-German code-mixing. The data presented is part of a study consisting of an online survey that collected demographic information on the participants and their reactions to short film clips. Clips in which characters speak German, Turkish, or a mixture of the two were chosen from two films by the Turkish-German director, Fatih Akin. The survey was available in German, Turkish, and English. This paper discusses open-ended responses to the survey with a concentration on evaluative comments regarding language use. The survey was administered to 20 native German speakers, 26 native Turkish speakers, and 12 native Turkish-German bilinguals. This paper expands upon themes in the responses with detailed content analysis. The results illuminate the connections that exist between the use of code-mixing and social characteristics in the minds of the participants. Results indicate that bilingual Turkish-German speakers as well as German-speakers and Turkish-speakers evaluate mixing negatively.

Keywords: bilingualism, language attitudes, Turkish, German, media.

Análisis del contenido de respuestas a una encuesta sobre actitudes lingüísticas hacia bilingüismo turco-alemán. En este artículo se investigan las actitudes hacia el cambio de código turco-alemán. Los datos presentados forman parte de un estudio que consiste en una encuesta en línea que recopiló información sobre los participantes y sus reacciones a pequeños fragmentos de películas. Los fragmentos escogidos proceden de dos películas dirigidas por el turco-alemán Fatih Akin y, en ellos, los personajes hablan alemán, turco o una mezcla de ambas lenguas. La encuesta se puso a disposición de los participantes en alemán, turco e inglés. Este trabajo se centra en las respuestas a preguntas abiertas, con un énfasis particular en comentarios evaluativos sobre los usos lingüísticos. La encuesta se administró a 20 hablantes nativos de alemán, 26 hablantes nativos de turco y 12

hablantes bilingües nativos de turco y alemán. El artículo amplía los temas de las respuestas con un análisis detallado de su contenido. Los resultados revelan las conexiones que existen en las mentes de los participantes entre el uso del cambio de código y algunas características sociales. Los resultados indican que tanto los bilingües turco-alemanes como los hablantes de alemán y turco evalúan la mezcla de lenguas negativamente.

Palabras claves: bilingüismo, actitudes lingüísticas, turco, alemán, medios.

1. Introduction

This study investigates attitudes regarding the use of Turkish-German code-mixing through an online survey including clips from two popular films by the director Fatih Akin. The survey was made up of demographic and language background questions and a series of short video clips followed by questions about the characters. The survey was administered to native German speakers from Germany, native Turkish speakers from Turkey, and native Turkish-German bilinguals who grew up in both countries or who were born in Germany to Turkish parents.

This paper presents a content analysis of the answers to open-ended questions in the survey which contained evaluative comments regarding language use. The purpose of the analysis was to determine which types of evaluative comments are made about Turkish-German mixing and how the types of comments differ between groups of participants. Results indicate that, while Germans and Turks did submit negative evaluations of mixing, the overwhelming majority of negative comments about Turkish-German mixing came from native bilinguals.

The history of the Turkish community in Germany begins on October 30, 1962 when Germany signed a labor agreement with Turkey. This agreement, referred to as the guest worker program, encouraged Turks to work in Germany temporarily (Göktürk, Gramling and Kaes 2007: 497). It wasn't until the 1980s that any integration policy was considered a necessity, as up until then migrants were still seen as 'guests' by the governments of both Germany and Turkey. By 2000, Germany had 2 million legal residents who were Turkish citizens and a new law made it easier for children born in Germany to become German citizens (Diraor 2009: 3). Although still under-educated, the second and third generations were employed in a greater variety of sectors (ibid). By 2010, more Turks were leaving Germany than entering. This can be

attributed to the increasing stability of Turkey and the continuing difficulty of successful integration into German society (Findlay 2010). Many returnees were born in Germany and have difficulty integrating into Turkish society, leaving them with a feeling of belonging neither here nor there (ibid).

The Turkish-German community has long struggled for acceptance in Germany and there is still tension between Turkish-Germans and non-Turkish Germans in Germany today. As found in other immigrant communities (e.g. Acosta-Belen 1984; Gibbons 1983; Poplack 1980; Zentella 1982), criticism of the community is often couched in terms of criticism of their language: either their perceived failure to learn German or the use of Turkish-German code-mixing (e.g. Deppermann 2007; Kallmeier and Keim 2003; Keim 2002).

2. Language Attitudes

This study is situated within the sociolinguistic research on language attitudes (e.g. Lambert 1967; Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain 2009; Preston 2010) and language ideology (e.g. Gal 2005; Lippi-Green 2004; Woolard 1998). In Garrett’s *Language Attitudes* (2010), he cites Sarnoff (1970) for the ‘core’ definition of *attitude*: “A disposition to react favourably or unfavourably to a class of objects.” Within sociolinguistic research on attitudes, the object to which individuals react is language and language variation. This study explores the beliefs that speakers in and around the Turkish-German community in Germany have about the use of Turkish-German code-mixing.

There is a lack of consensus about the use of the terms “code-switching” and “code-mixing.” This paper will use the term “code-mixing” to discuss the general phenomenon of multilingual discourse, as proposed by Muysken (2000). Public opinion surrounding code-mixing is generally negative. There are diverse reasons for mixing languages, varying from a desire to belong to the minority group (Auer 2005), a desire to distance oneself from the majority group (ibid), a way of bridging both cultures (Zentella as quoted in Scott 2002) or a sort of leveling among diverse dialects (Stavans 2004). None of these reasons are those cited by critics of code-mixing, who view it as proof of a lack of proficiency in either language (Zentella 1982) or see it as a disregard for one’s culture of heritage.

In his study on language attitudes within a Belgian high school, Agirdag (2010) found that Dutch-Turkish bilingual students expressed negative evaluations of their own bilingualism. He explained this as *doxa of monolingualism*, which is that the hegemonic view of using only

the majority language is imposed onto speakers of another language. The majority population in his study were not strictly monolingual. In fact, the study of prestigious languages such as English and French was highly valued. Rather, it was specifically the type of multilingualism displayed by native speakers of a language of low prestige (such as Turkish or Arabic) that was evaluated negatively. This is a type of *standard language ideology*, as defined by Lippi-Green (2004: 292): “a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, non-varying *spoken* language that is imposed and maintained by dominant institutions.”

Several scholars have documented the language use of second and third generation Turkish-Germans in spontaneous conversation, concentrating on the communities of Munich, Hamburg (Auer 2003), Mannheim (Keim 2002; Kallmeyer and Keim 2003) and Berlin (Selting and Kern 2009). This is not the speech of learners of German, which was the case of the *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* spoken by new immigrants in the 1970s (Hinnenkamp 1982). Rather, the speech of native Turkish-German speakers is an *ethnolect*: a way of speaking which is associated with one or more minority ethnic groups by the speaker and/or others (Auer 2003: 255). The use of Turkish-German code-switching was found to be “a meaningful resource to achieve particular goals in talk-in-interaction” (Selting and Kern 2009: 2497). The use of bilingual speech indexes the speakers as part of the community who speaks both languages and serves to contrast them with relevant out-group categories such as Germans or older Turkish immigrants to Germany (Keim 2002; Kallmeyer and Keim 2003).

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

Participants in the survey were native speakers of German and/or Turkish and at least 18 years old. The recruitment ad for the survey was distributed in English, German, and Turkish on Facebook and over email using the “friend-of-a-friend” or “snowball” technique (Milroy and Gordon 2003: 32). Native speakers of American English were used as a control group in a larger study (Kempesell Jacinto, Wassink, Bilaniuk and Evans 2015), and will be left out of the analysis in this paper.

The survey received 58 total responses from native speakers of Turkish and/or German. For the purposes of examining the attitudes of specific respondent groups, the subjects were separated into categories of native German speakers (20), native Turkish speakers (26), and Turkish-German bilinguals (12). While most of the native German-speakers and

native-Turkish speakers speak at least one other language (usually English), they were categorized by the language they have been exposed to since birth. Several participants in each category are living abroad. None of the Germans live in Turkey and only one of the Turks is in Germany (studying abroad). A number of Germans reported having studied Turkish and the same is true of Turks who have studied German as a foreign language. Those who were categorized as “Turkish-German” are participants who were either born in Germany to Turkish parents or who moved from Turkey to Germany at a young age.

The demographic break-down of the respondents is given in Table 1ⁱ.

Age /Language	German (m/f)	Turkish (m/f)	Turkish-German (m/f)	Total (m/f)
18-28	5 (1/4)	10 (5/5)	6 (2/4)	21 (8/13)
29-44	13 (7/6)	12 (2/10)	4 (0/4)	29 (9/20)
45 +	2 (1/1)	4 (2/2)	2 (0/2)	8 (3/5)
Total	20 (9/11)	26 (9/17)	12 (2/10)	58 (20/38)

Table 1. *Respondents by Age, Native Language and Genderⁱ*

3.2. Demographic questionnaire

In the first section of the survey, participants were asked to fill out a demographic questionnaire which collected information on the subjects’ linguistic and ethnic background as well as age, education level, and gender. Respondents were asked if they consider themselves “German,” “Turkish-German,” and/or “Turkish,” in which contexts they hear and use the languages. This section also included a question asking if there are any situations in which it is inappropriate to use German or Turkish.

Survey participants who indicated they speak both German and Turkish were asked two questions about their opinions about code-mixing²:

1) How comfortable are you mixing German and Turkish?

Wie leicht fällt es Ihnen, sich einer Mischung aus Deutsch und Türkisch zu bedienen?

Türkçe ve Almanca’yı karıştırarak ne kadar rahat kullanabilirsiniz?

and:

2) How comfortable are you with **other people** mixing German and Turkish?

Was halten Sie davon, wenn andere Leute eine Mischung aus Deutsch und Türkisch sprechen?

movies were each released with versions that have German subtitles, Turkish subtitles, and English subtitles. The German and Turkish versions are partially subtitled, meaning that only the other language is subtitled. The international release contains English subtitles for all dialogue.

3.4. Data Summary

The respondents were grouped into categories based on their language background, as determined by their responses to the questions of whether they speak German and/or Turkish, their age of acquisition of each of the languages, and their level of fluency in each language. Respondents who indicated they learned German and not Turkish from birth were categorized as German native speakers. The Turkish native speakers were defined in the same way. Participants who listed their ethnicity as Turkish or who were born in Turkey and raised in Germany, and who grew up using both languages, were included in the Turkish-German group.

Participants who indicated that they spoke both Turkish and German were asked how comfortable they are using a mixture of the languages and how they feel about others code-mixing. These questions lead to a total of 49 comments. Each participant was asked whether or not they consider themselves ‘German’, ‘Turkish’, and/or ‘Turkish-German’, and how important this identity is to them. The question of German identity led to 17 comments, Turkish identity resulted in 15 comments, and Turkish-German identity received seven comments.

Additional qualitative data was collected in the responses to the questions following each clip: “How did you feel during the following dialogue?” and “Did you notice anything interesting about the use of language?” There were a total of 258 responses given to these questions totaling across film and clip. Responses to all of these questions were the focus of the content analysis.

4. Content Analysis of survey responses

The content analysis was performed following the Pattern Coding process of qualitative data coding as described by Saldaña (2009). The purpose of the analysis was to determine which types of evaluative comments are made about Turkish-German mixing, and how the types of comments differ between groups of participants. Before addressing the research questions about attitudes towards language mixing, the types of responses that were received to two questions of language appropriateness will be described.

4.1. Language (in)appropriateness

4.1.1. German inappropriateness

In what contexts, if any, is it **not** appropriate to use German?

*In welchen Situationen, wenn überhaupt, ist es **nicht** angemessen, Deutsch zu verwenden?*

Sizce, nerelerde ve(ya) hangi koşullarda, eğer böyle bir ortam varsa, Almanca kullanmak uygun değil?

The question regarding German inappropriateness received 42 responses. Table 2 shows the categories of responses from Germans, Turks, and Turkish-Germans. The most common response, by far, was in the category labeled “intelligibility.” Responses in this category indicated that the participants feel it is only inappropriate to use German with or around people that don’t understand German. The remaining responses fell into the categories of “yes,” “no,” and “idk” (I don’t know). Of these, the largest category was “no” (11 responses), and only four named a place where German is not appropriate.

Group	Intelligibility	Yes	No	IDK	Total
G	9	3	3		15
T	12	1	6	2	21
TG	4		2		6
Total	25	4	11	2	42

Table 2. *German inappropriateness*

Table 3 contains examples in the category “no” for the question of German inappropriateness¹. These responses indicate that the participant believes there is no place where it is inappropriate to speak German.

	Subject	Gender	Group	Birth year:	Occupation	Comment
1	48	f	T	1985	student	Appropriate everywhere.
2	14	f	T	1986	Linguist	I think it's possible to speak German in every environment. I don't know if there's any environment where it's not appropriate.

Table 3. *German is inappropriate: “no”*

Table 4 displays all comments that answered the question of German inappropriateness with an affirmative. Of the four respondents who gave a place where German is inappropriate, three were native German-speakers: one answered, “Holocaust museum,” another said there are some academic contexts in which it is not appropriate, and a native German-speaker in the U.S. answered, “while shopping and in public.” There was one “yes” comment from a Turk and none from a Turkish-German.

	Subject	Gender	Group	Birth year:	Occupation	Comment
1	84	m	G	1960	Curator	Holocaust museum
2	36	f	G	1992	Student	While shopping, in public
3	67	f	G	1985	Doctoral student	Sometimes in academic surroundings

Table 4. *German is inappropriate: “yes”*

4.1.2. Turkish inappropriateness

The question about the inappropriateness of Turkish received 41 responses. Table 5 shows the categories of responses from Germans, Turks, and Turkish-Germans. As with the equivalent question about German, the most common responses to this question by far were some variation on “when you are with someone who doesn’t understand Turkish.” Three responses were labeled “I don’t know” and the remaining responses fit the categories “yes” and “no.” In contrast to the question about German inappropriateness, this time the comments indicating that there is a place that Turkish is inappropriate outnumbered the negative.

Group	Intelligibility	Yes	No	IDK	Total
G	8	2		2	12
T	10	6	5	1	22
TG	4	2	1		7
Total	22	10	6	3	41

Table 5. *Turkish is inappropriate: “yes”*

Table 6 gives examples of the category “no” for the question of Turkish inappropriateness.

	Subject	Gender	Group	Birth year:	Occupation	Comment
1	73	m	TG	1985	Doctoral student	I don't believe this. A person should be able to speak their native language everywhere freely. Every language is appropriate everywhere.
2	69	m	T	1989	student	Turkish can be used in every environment.

Table 6. *Turkish is inappropriate: “no”*

Table 7 shows all affirmative answers to the question, “In what contexts, if any, is it **not** appropriate to use Turkish?” Of the 11 responses, six were from native Turkish-speakers, three from native German-speakers, and two from a Turkish-German. In row 1, the comment “while I’m with my foreign friends” is probably meant in terms of intelligibility. In row 2 a native Turkish-speaking linguist states that, in Turkey, it is not appropriate to speak Turkish with Kurds and Arabs. In row 3 a native Turkish-speaker responded: “In Europe in environments where the majority don’t like Turks,” and in row 4 a native Turkish-speaking teacher in the U.S. said, “Work space?”

Lines 5 through 7 all indicate that there are certain academic situations in which subjects felt it inappropriate to use Turkish. In lines 8 and 9, both from native German-speakers, the responses fit two categories: the phrase in brackets was counted as “intelligibility,” and the remainder fit the category “yes.” In line 8 the respondent indicates it is not appropriate to use Turkish in official events, and in line 9 a German student in Lebanon replied: “Probably not in front of Armenians.” The last two comments are from Turkish-Germans. The one in line 10 is from a student in Germany who indicates that she rarely uses Turkish at school. The Turkish-German woman who replied “when I talk to my husband” in line 11 may have meant that her husband doesn’t understand Turkish, in which case this comment would be about intelligibility.

	Subject	Gender	Group	Birth year:	Occupation	Comment
1	9	f	T	1984	Research Assistant	While I'm with my foreign friends
2	14	f	T	1986	Linguist	While in Turkey, it was not appropriate to speak Turkish with our Kurdish and Arabic neighbors, other than that, in Turkey, Turkish is used in every public space.
3	74	f	T	1969	Lecturer	In Europe in environments where the majority don't like Turks.
4	57	m	T	1965	Teacher	Work space?
5	16	f	T	1990	MA student	in classrooms
6	49	m	T	1987	Student	In a class that's conducted in English.
7	68	m	G	1987	Mechanic	in German school, except in classes
8	20	m	G	1970	College teacher	In official events or [when the language would mostly not be understood]
9	62	m	G	1980	Student	[When the person in social contact doesn't speak Turkish.] Probably not in front of Armenians.
10	97	f	TG	1991	Student	I seldom use Turkish in the University
11	76	f	TG	1970	Childcare professional	when I talk to my husband

Table 7. *Turkish inappropriateness*

4.1.3. Discussion

The responses to the questions of German or Turkish inappropriateness provide some context for the following discussion of comments regarding Turkish-German language mixing.

By far the most common type of response to the questions about both German and Turkish appropriateness was the category “intelligi-

bility.” That is, rather than thinking of a specific place or context where either language is not appropriate, respondents generally came to the conclusion that the only reason to avoid a language would be so that interlocutors or even bystanders can understand the conversation.

The most interesting categories were those labeled “yes” and “no.” “No” indicated simply that the participant did not believe there is any situation in which the language is inappropriate. “Yes” contained responses, regarding either German or Turkish, in which the participant gave an example of a situation in which they believe the language is not appropriate. The proportions of these responses are where the difference between views towards German and Turkish come out.

The total numbers of responses in the categories “intelligibility,” “yes,” and “no” from Germans, Turks, and Turkish-German are reproduced in Table 8 (the responses of “I don’t know” are left out here). As seen in the rows for “yes” and “no,” the number of responses for each category in the columns “G inappropriate” and “T inappropriate” are almost exactly flipped. While there were four responses giving a situation where German is inappropriate compared to 11 saying there is no such situation, for Turkish there were 10 examples of inappropriate places and only six that there is none.

Category	G inappropriate	T inappropriate	Total
Intelligibility	25	22	47
Yes	4	10	14
No	11	6	17
Total	40	38	78

Table 8. *Inappropriateness of German and Turkish*

In proportion to the total number of participants in the survey, the number of comments giving a context in which one or the other language is inappropriate is very small. However, the differences between the responses regarding German and those about Turkish show that, even before the questions about language-mixing or about the dialogue in the specific film excerpts, the two languages are evaluated differently by these participants. Firstly, more respondents could think of places where Turkish is inappropriate as compared to German. Secondly, no Germans responded that there is no place where Turkish is inappropriate (see Table 5), while three of them submitted comments in that category for German (Table 4).

Finally, in looking in more detail at the content of the comments, there was a difference in reasons given for why either language might not be appropriate. There was only one respondent who gave an exam-

ple of a place where German might be offensive (Holocaust museum), while there were three such comments about Turkish (in front of Armenians, in front of Kurds and Arabs, and in front of Europeans who don't like Turks). While only one respondent indicated that there are some academic situations where German is not appropriate, there were four responses that Turkish is not appropriate in school. This supports the findings of Agirdag (2010) that members of the majority support a *doxa of monolingualism*, in discouraging the use of minority languages in schools.

There were very few responses to these questions from native Turkish-German bilinguals. They submitted only 13 total comments, in comparison to the 27 from Germans and 43 from Turks. This would not appear surprising given that there were fewer Turkish-German participants in the survey than participants in the other respondent groups. However, as discussed in the following section, the bilingual group responded at a much higher rate to the questions about Turkish-German mixing.

4.2. Attitudes to Code-mixing

The analysis of attitudes to code-mixing was done on all comments submitted to the survey that included an evaluation of code-mixing. There were a total of 49 answers to the questions asking all participants who reported some knowledge of both Turkish and German about their opinions on code-mixing directly. In addition, out of the total of 258 responses to the open-ended questions about the movie clips, there were 38 responses that contained an evaluation of the use of code-mixing. Combining these comments, there were a total of 87 comments that contained some sort of evaluation of code-mixing. These comments were the focus of the content analysis.

The analysis was conducted with two research questions in mind. Research Question 1 asks which types of evaluative comments are made in regards to Turkish-German code-mixing. Research Question 2 asks about the ways that comments about code-mixing differ between participant groups. This research question has two hypotheses. Code-mixing has been demonstrated to be stigmatized by the surrounding monolingual majority in a variety of communities (see, for example, Zentella 1982), and for that reason the first hypothesis is that the monolingual German and Turkish speakers will evaluate mixing negatively. Hypothesis 2, regarding the Turkish-German bilinguals, has two sub-hypotheses. It has been demonstrated that members of a stigmatized language community will adopt the view of the majority and evaluate their own language variety negatively (see Lambert *et al.* 1960; Lambert

1967; Zentella 1982; and Lippi-Green 1997), and for this reason Hypothesis 2A is that Turkish-German bilinguals will also evaluate mixing negatively in terms of status. However, some of the same research (e.g. Lambert 1960; Zahn and Hopper 1985) has shown that members of the minority evaluate their own group positively on measures of solidarity, and for this reason Hypothesis 2B predicts that Turkish-Germans will evaluate mixing positively in terms of covert prestige.

- RQ 1) What types of evaluative comments are made in regard to Turkish-German code-mixing?
- RQ 2) How do(es) the native language(s) of a speaker affect the evaluative comments that they make towards Turkish-German code-mixing?
 - H1: Turkish and German speakers will evaluate mixing negatively,
 - H2: Bilingual Turkish-German speakers will
 - A. approximate monolingual Turkish and German speakers in negative evaluations in terms of status,
 - B. evaluate mixing positively in terms of solidarity.

The nature of the research question involving the evaluation of Turkish-German language mixing defined the first step in the coding process: the first level of coding involved the categorization of the comments according to the polarity of their evaluation (positive, negative, and neutral).

20 comments related to code-mixing were negative, 52 were neutral, and 15 were positive. There were a few cases in which a single comment covered more than one category. For example, subject 39 responded to the question, “how comfortable are you mixing German and Turkish?” with the comment, “It’s easy, but I’ve always taken care to speak either one or the other. My parents put great value on that.” Because the comment was split between two types of evaluations, these comments were analyzed as two separate tokens.

Table 9 summarizes the first level of coding for comments that evaluated the use of code-mixing. The categories are listed according to the participant group of the respondent. Neutral comments are by far the most common for each group of respondents.

Group	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Total
G	4	16	5	25
T	3	18	6	27
TG	13	18	4	35
Total	20	52	15	87

Table 9. *Code-mixing comments*

Table 10 presents a more in-depth look at the negative comments regarding code-mixing. Not only did bilinguals respond to code-mixing with evaluative comments much more frequently than did other participants, but their reasons for responding negatively or positively were different from the other groups. Of the four negative comments given by Germans, three were that the use of code-mixing in the film seemed unrealistic, and only one actually characterized code-mixing as ‘bad’. The three negative comments given by Turks were actually negative evaluations of the use of code-mixing. Considering the bilingual Turkish-German participants, out of their 13 total negative comments regarding code-mixing, one comment was simply that the participant ‘doesn’t do it’, one was that the code-mixing in the movie is unrealistic and the other 11 comments were negative evaluations of code-mixing.

Group	Bad	I don't do it	Unrealistic	Total
G	1		3	4
T	3			3
TG	11	1	1	13
Total	15	1	4	20

Table 10. “*Negative*” comments regarding code-mixing

Being that there were only 15 comments with an overtly negative evaluation of code-mixing it is possible to display them all here and discuss them in more detail. All 15 comments are displayed in Table 11.

The first five comments were in response to the question, “how comfortable are you mixing German and Turkish?” In lines 1 through 3 the subjects, all native bilinguals, indicated that they are very comfortable mixing languages but that they try not to or they think it is inappropriate. The subject in line 4, also a bilingual, indicates that, although she tries to keep the languages separate, it is very easy to switch between them. Finally, subject 97, also bilingual, indicates that she avoids mixing the languages. In contrast to the first four respondents, she does not perceive herself as accidentally slipping into code-mixing and would only do it on purpose.

Lines 6 through 10 are comments that were given in response to the question asking how comfortable participants are hearing other people mix German and Turkish and lines 11 through 15 are comments that were given in response to the movie clips.

	Subject	Gender	Group	Birth-year	Occupation	Comment
1	39	f	TG	1975	Hotel professional	[It's easy,] but I've always taken care to speak either one or the other. My parents put great value on that.
2	77	f	TG	1968	Teacher	[It's used easily,] but I don't think it's appropriate. A Turkish lady saying 'kom o?lum'.
3	82	f	TG	1985	Doctoral student	[Very easy. When I talk with my parents I often make use of mixed speech.] Unfortunately, that transfers over to my Turkish language skills, so when I talk with Turks who don't speak German I still use German terms.
4	87	f	TG	1994	Student	I personally try as much as possible to keep the languages separate. That tends to be very difficult for us Turks in Germany. When Turkish I can't think of a I start to speak specific word in Turkish and use the same word in German instead.
5	97	f	TG	1991	Student	I avoid mixing both languages. If I did it, then it would be on purpose.
6	39	f	TG	1975	Hotel professional	Not much.
7	73	m	TG	1985	Doctoral student	Mostly Turks living in Germany. And the bigger majority is the second and third generations. The Turks in Germany need to give more importance to education. If I had a choice, of course I would want them to speak both German and Turkish like their native languages. Because all languages are beautiful, just speaking these two languages as native languages changes and improves one's world view.
8	77	f	TG	1968	Teacher	[It's used easily,] but I don't think it's appropriate. A Turkish lady saying it's o?lum'.
9	97	f	TG	1991	Student	It shows me that these people don't speak good Turkish or German.
10	98	f	G	1944	Secretary	When it's for convenience' sake I don't think much of it.
11	33	f	T	1990	Teacher	frankly I didn't find it very pleasant. Either speak all in German or all in Turkish. Speaking disconnected like that isn't very pleasant.
12	76	f	TG	1970	Childcare professional	irritated that Yeter also speaks German
13	2	f	T	1978	Professor	Weird. Mixing two languages sounds lazy especially for non-technical terms.
14	33	f	T	1990	Teacher	It reminded me of that code-switching thing but I didn't like it very much; it's as if Ali doesn't want to speak German but the feeling is raised that he needs to speak it for Nejat. Because while defining Ali as a typical Turk, it is possible to say that Nejat is stuck in the middle (Turkish-German).
15	77	f	TG	1968	Teacher	I did not like Nejat's speaking German with his father who speaks Turkish. He should have been modest.

Table 11. *Negative comments*

There were a total of 15 comments regarding code-mixing that were positive, as shown in Table 12. As was the case with negative comments, the positive comments fell into several categories. The ‘good’ comments about code-mixing, given in Table 13, were all given in response to the questions asking directly about code-mixing. Out of the six comments describing code-mixing as “good,” four were given by Turks, one was from a German, and one from a Turkish-German.

Group	Good	Realistic	Appropriate	Language observation	Unclear	Funny	Total
G	1	3	1				5
T	4	1				1	6
TG	1		1	1	1		4
Total	6	4	2	1	1	1	15

Table 12. “Positive” comments regarding code-mixing

	Subject	Gender	Group	Birth-year	Occupation	Comment
1	9	f	T	1984	Research Assistant	good
2	32	f	G	1989	Director	It makes me happy.
3	43	m	T	1983	Engineer	I believe that some words are more powerful to convey a point if used in a different language. For instance, when you try to explain what a song in Turkish is talking about to an English friend, I realize that the point of the song seems trivial or not as powerful as it is originally intended to be.
4	69	m	T	1989	student	Good for them
5	75	f	TG	1967	business employee	When it's between kindred spirits, I find it okay!
6	79	m	T	1964	teacher	Great

Table 13. “Good” comments about code-mixing

A challenge in coding ‘neutral’ evaluations was separating them from comments with no evaluation of code-mixing at all. During the analysis, comments pointing out that characters were using two languages or

simply giving the word “code-switching,” were considered observational rather than evaluational. However, comments with the word “typical,” or even “normal” were considered an evaluation of code-mixing, without being positively or negatively assessed. In addition, comments containing words like “interesting” or “fascinating” in regards to mixing were included.

Group	Language observation	Don't care	Unclear	Easy	Not Easy	Normal	Total
G	3	1		3	3	6	16
T	1	1		3	1	12	18
TG	1	1	2	8	1	5	18
Total	5	3	2	14	5	23	52

Table 14. “Neutral” comments about code-mixing

There were 52 comments about code-mixing categorized as “neutral.” As in positive and negative evaluations, neutral evaluations can be further divided into several categories. Five were categorized as a “language observation,” in which the participant made some sort of observation about code-mixing in the clip that was neither overtly positive nor negative. Three ‘neutral’ comments indicated that the respondent simply “doesn’t care” when others mix German and Turkish. Two other comments were labeled “unclear” because, while the comment was about code-mixing and wasn’t clearly positively or negatively valued, it was unclear just what the respondent was trying to say.

The “easy” and “not easy” comments were both coded as “neutral.” These comments were included under the broad category of “neutral” because, while at first glance “easy” seems like a positive characterization and “not easy” seems negative, taking the context into account can change that analysis. A native bilingual who describes code-mixing as “easy” might equate that ease with laziness. Indeed, the first three comments in Table 11 of the “negative” comments (all by Turkish-German participants) were each prefaced by saying “it’s easy, but...” and then giving a negative evaluation of code-mixing.

The majority of the comments in the “easy” category came from Turkish-Germans (eight out of 14). All but one of these comments came in answer to the question about how comfortable the participant is mixing German and Turkish. They are all from distinct respondents except for subject 77 who submitted the same comment in response to the question about mixing languages and about reactions to hearing others mix languages. A selection of these comments are displayed in Table 15.

The first four rows in Table 15 include comments that were also discussed in the section on “negative” comments, above. These comments were all submitted by Turkish-Germans and start out with a comment that mixing languages is very easy for them, but then end with a negative evaluation of mixing. Lines 5 through 7 all describe mixing as a “way of life” for the participants. The last three rows include comments that mixing is “very easy,” without more context.

	Subject	Gender	Group	Birth-year	Occupation	Comment
1	82	f	tg	1985	Doctoral students	Very easy. When I talk with my parents I often make use of mixed speech. [Unfortunately, that transfers over to my Turkish language skills, so when I talk with Turks who don't speak German I still use German terms.]
2	77	f	tg	1968	Teacher	it's used easily, [but I don't think it's appropriate. A Turkish lady saying 'kom o?lum'.]
3	77	f	tg	1968	Teacher	it's used easily, [but I don't think it's appropriate. A Turkish lady saying 'kom o?lum'.]
4	39	f	tg	1975	hotel professional	It's easy, [but I've always taken care to speak either one or the other. My parents put great value on that.]
5	32	f	g	1989	Director	Easy. When I talk to my brother or with other people I grew up with in Istanbul I often speak a mixture of German and Turkish.
6	79	m	t	1964	teacher	I can always think by mixing...
7	86	f	tg	1979	employee	Very easy, when I'm with somebody who can also speak both languages, both languages are used. Whichever word comes to me first is spoken. Whether German or Turkish
8	76	f	tg	1970	Childcare professional	Very easy.
9	98	f	g	1944	Secretary	Very easy
10	99	m	tg	1985	Student	Very easy. Speak both languages in emergencies as a supplement :)

Table 15. “Easy” neutral comments

Group	Typical	Possible	Comfortable	Fine	Total
G	4	1		1	6
T	5	4	2	1	12
TG	2	2	1		5
Total	11	7	3	2	23

Table 16. “Normal” neutral comments

The remaining 23 neutral comments were categorized as “normal,” as in “mixing German and Turkish is normal.” Of these comments, six came from Germans, 12 from Turks, and five from Turkish-Germans. It is worth pointing out that these comments come from only 14 individual respondents: seven respondents gave one comment in this category, and seven respondents submitted two or more comments. Subject 9 alone, a Turkish respondent, submitted five comments in this category.

A selection of these comments are listed in Table 17. Rows 1 through 3 contain comments sub-categorized as “comfortable.” Two of these come from a Turk and one from a Turkish-German. These comments indicate that for them, code-mixing is “normal” because they are used to hearing it or using it in their daily life. Row 4 contains a comment that was sub-categorized as “fine.” This comment, from a German, indicates that mixing languages is “fine”: neutral in that it is distinguished from being bad.

The remaining comments in Table 17 are from the sub-category “typical.” Four of the comments actually contain the word “typical” and two used the word “classic” in reference to the Turkish-German mixing.

	Subject	Gender	Group	Birth-year	Occupation	Comment
1	5	f	T	1982	student	It seemed normal to me because I'm used to it.
2	5	f	T	1982	student	No the dialogues that I'm used to but Ali swears a lot after he gets drunk
3	86	f	TG	1979	employee	Doesn't bother me I do it myself. I understand it
4	15	f	G	1988	Student	I haven't thought about it. Nothing bad, as long as both languages can be held apart in important moments. I do it myself with my 2nd mother tongue.
5	9	f	T	1984	Research Assistant	Not surprising. It is after all a Turkish German movie.
6	10	f	T	1984	Research Assistant	A typical dialogue for a Turk raised and living in Germany.
7	16	f	T	1990	MA student	No so outside of the dialogue, actually I have seen the movie and I am expecting something like that will appear, notso surprising
8	20	m	G	1970	College teacher	Typical distribution of the language to the roles, father only mother tongue, son only "his" language
9	23	m	G	1978	higher education administrative assistant	Typical code-switching common in bilingual families. We did this in my English-German family context. Lots of Latinos in the U.S. do this.
10	29	f	T	1985	engineer	Classic Turkish-German dialogue.
11	29	f	T	1985	engineer	No it's a classic Turkish-German dialogue.
12	83	m	G	1970	academic employee (Turkologist!)	I didn't have any specific feelings -the Turkish-German mixing is a linguistic reality
13	83	m	G	1970	academic employee (Turkologist!)	I often experience the mixing by younger Turks who find that while speaking Turkish they are missing expressions in Turkish, which is certain ex why they switch to German for single vocabulary items or some phrases. Besides that, mixing an expression of the reality of life for people from Turkey in Germany.
14	76	f	TG	1970	Childcare professional	That's just how it i

Table 17. "Normal" neutral comments, 3rd level of analysis

4.3. Discussion

The process of categorizing comments according to polarity has led to some interesting observations about the types of patterns that exist within comments about code-mixing. Coming back to the first research question, it is possible to talk about the types of evaluative comments that are made in regards to Turkish-German code-mixing. The categorization of responses to open-ended questions into the broad categories of ‘positive’, ‘negative’, and ‘neutral’ served as a good first level of content analysis, and each of these categories were further divided into several sub-categories.

For the second research question, the first hypothesis was, “Turkish and German speakers will evaluate mixing negatively.” The survey did receive negative evaluations of mixing by Turkish-speakers and German-speakers. However, there were far more neutral comments and actually more positive comments from monolinguals about code-mixing than there were negative comments. Therefore, the results of the content analysis did not support Hypothesis 1.

Group	# Subjects	Total # comments	Mean # comments/subject	Mean # evaluative comments /subject	Mean # ‘bad’ comments /subject
G	20	113	5.65	1.25	.05
T	26	119	4.58	1.04	.12
TG	12	75	6.25	2.92	.92

Table 18. *Percentage comment categories*

Hypothesis 2A, that bilingual Turkish-German speakers would evaluate mixing negatively, received support. In fact, Turkish-Germans submitted far more negative evaluations of code-mixing than did any other group. Table 18 highlights the different proportions of comments submitted by each group. While there were fewer Turkish-German subjects in the study, they submitted comments at a higher rate. Considering all comments subjected to content analysis, Turkish-Germans submitted an average of 6.25 comments each, while Germans submitted 5.65 and Turks only 5.48. Narrowing the focus to comments that included an evaluation of code-mixing, Turkish-Germans submitted an average of 2.92 comments each, and the averages for Germans and Turks, respectively, were 1.25 and 1.04. Narrowing the focus even

further to look only at the comments that evaluated code-mixing as bad, Turkish-Germans submitted an average of 0.92 comments each. That's more than 18 times the rate for German respondents and almost eight times that of Turkish respondents.

It is not possible to conclude that monolinguals do not evaluate mixing negatively because they did not include many negative comments in the survey. The number of total tokens analyzed for content analysis is not large enough for a test of statistical significance. What is possible to say is that native Turkish-German bilingual respondents to this survey display a strong tendency to evaluate language mixing negatively. These respondents, while self-identifying as part of the Turkish-German community, are exhibiting linguistic insecurity (Labov 1972) about their community's language. As in previous sociolinguistic research on attitudes (e.g. Lambert *et al.* 1960; Lambert 1967) as well as in literature on language attitudes of bilinguals (e.g. Agirdag 2010; Gibbons 1983; Zentella 1982), these participants are expressing negative evaluations of their own patterns of language use.

A stigmatization of code-mixing has been noted in other bilingual communities (e.g. Zentella 1982) and is usually explained as an adoption of the linguistic attitudes of the majority by that of the minority. Previous studies, such as Lambert (1960) have seen more negative attitudes towards a stigmatized variety by the speakers of that variety as compared to members of the surrounding community, but the extreme difference in proportions of negative comments was unexpected.

Hypothesis 2B was that Turkish-Germans would evaluate mixing positively in terms of solidarity. Turkish-Germans actually gave fewer positive comments than either Germans or Turks and proportionally fewer positive comments than negative or neutral. However, a closer look at the "normal" category of "neutral" comments might point to the existence of some amount of solidarity in mixing for native bilinguals. The "easy" sub-category of "normal," indicating that code-mixing is easy for the respondent, was dominated by comments from Turkish-Germans (eight out of 14). As seen in Table 15, even the comment that mixing German and Turkish is easy for a participant is stated in different ways. Four of the comments indicated that mixing is easy, but this statement prefaced an overall negative evaluation of mixing. The remaining comments described mixing as easy without a following negative evaluation. These comments can be interpreted as an expression of solidarity with the Turkish-German community. Bilinguals who submitted this type of comment were identifying positively with the community of Turkish-German speakers. The native Germans and Turks who made this type of comment all had some experience with the other language, having chosen to study it in school or to travel to the

other country. Their expression of comfort mixing the languages can also be interpreted as a positive evaluation.

The categorization of Turkish-German code-mixing as “normal” could itself be indicative of solidarity. As seen in work by Preston (e.g. 2010), speakers with high linguistic security often describe their own variety as “normal.” Participants who described the mixed variety as “normal,” as opposed to “bad” or “wrong’ could be expressing some sort of positive evaluation of the variety and, by extension, of the community. Further research is needed to delve into the attitudes of this bilingual community, particularly to look at the possibility of positive evaluations on the dimension of solidarity as opposed to status.

5. Conclusion

The differences between the responses regarding the German language and those about Turkish show that, even before the questions about language-mixing or about the dialogue in the specific film excerpts, the two languages are evaluated differently by some participants. Firstly, more respondents could think of places where Turkish is inappropriate as compared to German. Secondly, no Germans responded that there is no place where Turkish is inappropriate while three of them submitted comments in that category for German. There are more respondents who gave situations where Turkish is inappropriate and there is a broader range of situations in which it is said to be inappropriate. German, in contrast, appears to be perceived as acceptable in almost any context.

In contrast to the responses from German respondents and Turkish respondents, there were very few responses to the questions of language (in)appropriateness from native Turkish-German bilinguals. This suggests that, before bringing up issues of language-mixing, bilinguals see the languages German and Turkish as equally appropriate in all situations. They value each language separately, but as seen in the analysis of attitudes towards code-mixing, bilinguals have more to say about Turkish-German mixing.

Proportionately, members of the bilingual Turkish-German group gave many more negative evaluations of language-mixing than did members of the monolingual German and Turkish participant groups. Thus, bilingual respondents to the survey displayed a strong tendency to evaluate language mixing negatively. These respondents, while self-identifying as part of the Turkish-German community, are exhibiting linguistic insecurity about their community’s language.

The responses in this category are very similar to the communicative practices of the “European Turks” as described by Keim (2002: 288).

This group of second-generation Turks in Germany valued speaking both German and Turkish separately, but negatively evaluated Turkish-German mixing. However, similarly to the Turkish-German participants in the present study, these same subjects were found to mix languages themselves in informal contexts.

The results of the content analysis support Agirdag's (2010) *doxa of monolingualism*. Under this theory, the hegemonic view of using only the majority language is imposed onto speakers. In this case, both the Turkish and the German languages are valued separately, but the use of both languages together is evaluated negatively by the very community for which language mixing is the norm.

It is interesting to contrast the pattern of evaluations of the native Turkish speakers with the Turkish-German bilinguals. While the native Turkish speakers who are not surrounded by a German-speaking majority still evaluate German as appropriate in more contexts than Turkish, they do not offer many negative evaluations of Turkish-German mixing. Their responses give evidence that German is a more prestigious language than Turkish and that this prestige is recognized by native Turkish-speakers. For the native German speakers and the Turkish-German bilinguals, the evaluations are shaped by a sociocultural context in which German is a majority language and Turkish is a minority language. However, for the native Turkish speakers, the context is different. They do not live in a context where Turkish is spoken by a minority population and the use of code-mixing is not as salient as the use of each language individually.

The results of this study highlight the importance of contextualizing the community of interest in an analysis of language attitudes, particularly in a bilingual setting. It might be expected that bilingual speakers would hold the same attitudes expressed by each group of monolingual speakers of the speech communities they are surrounded by. However, bilingual views are not "the sum of the parts" of monolingual views towards language. Future research on language attitudes in bilingual communities will need to take these issues into consideration.

The analysis would be strengthened by an experimental setting in which a structure survey could be followed by an in-depth interview that asks the respondents to reflect on their choices to the survey questions.

Wendy C Kempself Jacinto
Independent researcher
kempself@uw.edu
ORCID: 0000-0003-2604-0062

Recepción: 05/09/2016; Aceptación: 24/06/2017

Notes

- ¹ Comments that were submitted in German or Turkish have been translated and verified with native-speaker consultants.
- ² Note: There are respondents who are represented more than once in these tables. In Tables 11 and 15, for example, subject 77 gave the same comment for both the question about mixing Turkish and German themselves and for how they feel when others mix the languages.

References

- Acosta-Belen, Edna. 1975. "Spanglish: a case of languages in contact". In: *New directions in second language learning, teaching, and bilingual education*, Marina K. Burt and Heidi C. Dulay (eds.), 151-58. Washington: TESOL.
- 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.
- Akin, Fatih. 2004. "Gegen die Wand". *Wüste Filmproduktion*.
- Akin, Fatih. 2007. "Auf der Anderen Seite". *Anka Film*.
- Allport, Gordon W. 1935. "Attitudes". In: *A handbook of social psychology, vol. II*, Carl Murchison (ed.), 798-844. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis K. and Alexandra Georgakopoulou. 2003. *Discourse constructions of youth identities*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub.
- Auer, Peter. 2003. "'Türkenslang': Ein jugendsprachlicher Ethnolekt des Deutschen und seine Transformationen". In: *Spracherwerb und Lebensalter. Kolloquium anlässlich des 60. Geburtstags von Harald Burger*. Basel, Annelies Häcki-Buhofer (ed.), 255-264. Tübingen: Francke.
- Auer, Peter. 2005. "A postscript: code-switching and social identity". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37. 403-410.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2007. "Playing with the voice of the other: stylized Kanaksprak in conversations among German adolescents". In: *Style and social identities: alternative approaches to linguistic heterogeneity*, Peter Auer (ed.), 325-360. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dirao, Burcu Miraç. 2009. "How to Mobilise the Turkish Diaspora as a Political and Economic Actor. In the EU Accession Process". *11th Annual Kokkalis Graduate Student Workshop*. Available at: <<https://goo.gl/zwuK1j>>
- Findlay, S. 2010. "Germany: Leaving for greener pastures: Better opportunities are luring Turkish 'guest workers' back home". *Maclean's*, 123:40. 44.
- Gal, Susan. 2005. "Language ideologies compared: Metaphors of Public/Private". *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15:1. 23-37.
- Garrett, Peter. 2010. *Language attitudes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbons, John P. 1983. "Attitudes towards language and code-mixing in Hong Kong". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 4. 129-47.
- Göktürk, Deniz, David Gramling, and Anton Kaes. 2007. *Germany in transit: Nation and migration, 1955-2005*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hinnenkamp, Volker. 1989. "'Turkish Man You?' The Conversational Accomplishment of the Social and Ethnic Category of 'Turkish Guestworker'". *Human Studies: A Journal for Philosophy and the Social Sciences*, 12:1-2. 117-146.
- Kallmeyer, Werner and Inken Keim. 2003. "Linguistic variation and the construction of social identity in a German-Turkish setting". In: *Discourse constructions of youth identity*, Jannis K. Androutsopoulos and Alexandra Georgakopoulou (eds.), 29-46. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub.

- Keim, Inken. 2002. "Social style of communication and bilingual speech practices: Case study of three migrant youth groups of Turkish origin in Mannheim/Germany". *Turkic Languages*, 6. 284-299.
- Kempself Jacinto, Wendy, Alicia Beckford Wassink, Laada Bilaniuk, and Betsy Evans. 2015. *Language Attitudes and Bilingualism in Turkish-German Popular Film*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: U. Pennsylvania.
- Lambert, Wallace E., R. C. Hodgson, R. C. Gardner, and S. Fillenbaum. 1960. "Evaluational reactions to spoken languages". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60:1. 44-51.
- Lambert, Wallace E. 1967. "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism". *The Journal of Social Issues*, 23:2. 91-109.
- Liebscher, Grit and Jennifer Dailey O'Cain. 2009. "Languages in interaction". *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 13:2. 195-122.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997. *English with an accent: language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. 2004. "Language ideology and language prejudice". In: *Language in the USA: Themes for the twenty-first century*, E. Finegan and John Rickford (eds.), 289-304. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milroy, Lesley and Matthew Gordon. 2003. *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Preston, Dennis. 2010. "Language, People, Salience and Space: Perceptual Dialectology and Language Regard". *Dialectologia*, 5. 87-131.
- Saldaña, Johnny. 2009. "The coding manual for qualitative researchers". London; Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.
- Sarnoff, I. 1970. "Social attitudes and the resolution of motivational conflict". In: *Attitudes*, Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren (eds.), 279-84. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Scott, Janny. 2002. "In Simple Pronouns, Clues to Shifting Latino Identity". New York: New York Times.
- Selting, Margret and Friederike Kern. 2009. "On some syntactic and prosodic structures of Turkish German in talk-in-interaction". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41:12. 2496-2514.
- Stavans, Ilan. 2004. *Spanglish: the making of a new American language*. New York: Rayo.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2011. *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1998. "Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry". In: *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, Bambi B. Schieffelen, Kathryn A. Woolard, and Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), 3-47. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zahn, Christopher and Robert Hopper. 1985. "Measuring Language Attitudes: The Speech Evaluation Instrument". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 4:2. 113-123.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1981. "Ta bien, you could answer me in cualquier idioma: Puerto Rican codeswitching in bilingual classrooms". In: *Latino language and communicative behavior*, R. Duran (ed.), 109-13. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Zentella, Ana Celia. 1982. "Spanish and English in Contact in the United States: The Puerto Rican Experience". *Word: Journal of the International Linguistic Association*, 33:1-2. 41-57.