

Moving between languages: Turkish returnees from Germany

Book or Report Section

Accepted Version

Daller, M. H. and Treffers-Daller, J. ORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6575-6736> (2014) Moving between languages: Turkish returnees from Germany. In: Menzel, B. and Engel, C. (eds.) Rückkehr in die Fremde? Ethnische Remigration russlanddeutscher Spätaussiedler. Ost-West-Express. Kultur und Übersetzung (21). Frank & Timme, Berlin, pp. 185-212. ISBN 9873865964663 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/39024/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Publisher: Frank & Timme

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

In: Menzel, B. and Engel, S. (Eds.) (2014): *Rueckkehr in die Fremde?* Pp. 185 - 211. Berlin: Frank & Timme Verlag.

Michael Helmut Daller /Jeanine Treffers-Daller

Moving between Languages: Turkish Returnees from Germany¹

1. Introduction

The aim of the present chapter is to offer a comprehensive overview of linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of the migration movements between Turkey and Germany. From a sociolinguistic perspective the migration from Turkey to Germany and vice versa since 1961 is unique because it is one of the few situations worldwide which involves huge numbers of migrants in both directions. From a linguistic perspective it is highly relevant to look into this language pair because Turkish and German come from structurally very different languages. German is a West-Germanic language and it shares many properties with for example English, whereas Turkish belongs to the Altaic language family and is often seen as a prototype of an agglutinating language. This also adds to the complexity of the task since typological differences between the languages have to be taken into account. Researchers on immigrant bilinguals in Europe are faced with the particular problem of comparing proficiency in language pairs with large structural differences (such as Dutch/Arabic or German/Turkish). Research into the efficiency of measures that can be used across different languages is therefore vital. Many studies in bilingualism focus only on a specific point in time and longitudinal studies with larger samples are extremely rare. The studies reported in this chapter are an exception as many of these are longitudinal.

After a short overview on the Turkish work migration to Europe, we will focus on work of a specific subgroup namely the returnees.² These are children and young adults who were either born in German-speaking countries or moved there at a very young age. After attending schools in Germany, Austria or Switzerland, with German as the language of instruction, they went back to Turkey to attend Turkish schools and universities. The linguistic biography of these bilinguals is characterized by a double change in their language of schooling. When they grew up in German-speaking countries the main language spoken at home

¹ We would like to thank Dr John Turlik for his comments on an earlier version of this chapter.

² We use the term “re-migrants” for migrants from Germany to Turkey in general, and the term “returnees” for those re-migrants that are at school age.

was Turkish in many cases.³ Then they attended schools where the language of instruction was German. In some cases Turkish was supported by the German schools, although most of the participants in the studies presented here did not receive substantial support for their first language in Germany. One has to bear in mind that for many children, Kurdish and not Turkish is their first language; for Kurdish there is practically no support in the school-system of the German-speaking countries. There are estimates that around 500.000 Kurds live in Germany,⁴ although not all come from Turkey. The age of return to Turkey has been remarkably constant over the years. Typically returnees are between 13 and 15 years old upon return.⁵ This is an indication that one of the reasons for their return is that the parents want to have a chance to enrol their children in the Turkish school system. This involves, however, a further change of the school language. Although this double change of the dominant language is a challenge for the bilingual individuals involved in this process, it gives valuable insights into bilingualism as a fluid process where language dominance changes depending on a variety of factors. In this chapter we use the expression “back” to Turkey, but one has to bear in mind that for many returnees, Turkey was a “foreign” home country which they visited only for summer holidays. A quote from a participant highlights this:

“Wir kamen immer in die Türkei, in der Ferienzeit, es war alles toll, super ... aber hier leben, das ist was anderes, das hatten wir nicht begriffen.“⁶

(We always went to Turkey, during the holidays, it was fabulous, super ... but living here is something different, we had not realised that.)

(Zeynep, 25 years old, since 10 years back in Turkey)

³ For details see also Daller, Helmut: *Migration und Mehrsprachigkeit*. Frankfurt am Main 1999.

⁴ Drucksache 14/ 2676. Antwort der Bundesregierung auf die Kleine Anfrage der Abgeordneten Ulla Jelpke (answer of the German government to the request of Ulla Jelpke (MP)).

⁵ For an overview see Daller, Helmut: Migration und bilinguale Sprachentwicklung. Türkische Rückkehrer aus Deutschland. (Migration and bilingual language development. Turkish returnees from Germany). In: Hinnenkamp, Volker; Meng, Katharina (Hg.): *Sprachgrenzen überspringen. Sprachliche Hybridität und polykulturelles Selbstverständnis* (Crossing language boundaries. Linguistic hybrids and poly-cultural identities, Tübingen 2005, S. 325-345.

⁶ Daller: *Migration und bilinguale Sprachentwicklung*, S. 330.

Bilen and Develi⁷ stated almost twenty years ago that there are hardly any empirical studies about the returnees. Since then a number of studies have been published and the present chapter reports on most of them. Given the huge migration movements between Turkey and Germany over the last 50 years the scarcity of empirical studies which focus on linguistic aspects of the migration movement of the returnees is astonishing. One reason for this might be the logistical difficulties of tracing back the re-migrants in Turkey. Another reason might be that studies on such bilingual immigrants in the European host countries are seen as more relevant than those forgotten re-migrants.

2. The Turkish migration to and from Germany

2.1 Migration to Germany

Since the beginning of the 1960s there has been a considerable Turkish work migration to Europe. The reasons for this were the population growth in Turkey and a demand for workers in the host countries – France, the Netherlands and especially Germany. The population in Turkey doubled between 1969 and 1990 from 27 million to 56 million.⁸ To compensate for this population growth the Turkish economy would have had to create between 400.000 and 600.000 jobs each year. Because this was not possible, the unemployment rate was much higher than the official 10%. Many street workers or day labourers did not appear in the official unemployment statistics. So, for many Turkish workers, the migration to Europe was a unique chance. It was also a welcomed opportunity for the Turkish economy as pressure was taken from the job market and a considerable number of transfer payments from Europe back to Turkey were made by the work migrants. It was also an economic opportunity for the host countries, especially Germany, where the economic growth would have been impossible without work migrants. The first recruitment agreement (*Anwerbevereinbarung*) bet-

⁷ Bilen, Hülya; Develi, Günay: Sprachstandsanalyse des Deutsche bei Germanistikstudenten/ innen der Istanbul Universität (Language proficiency in German of students of German at Istanbul University), in: Treffers-Daller, Jeanine; Daller, Helmut.(Hg.): *Zwischen den Sprachen. Sprachgebrauch, Sprachmischung und Sprachfähigkeiten türkischer Rückkehrer aus Deutschland* (Between the languages, language use, language mixing and language proficiency of Turkish returnees from Germany), Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, The Language Center Series, vol. 2, 1995, S. 73-81, hier S. 73.

⁸ Zentrum für Türkeistudien (Hg.): *Migration Movements from Turkey to the European Community*. Bonn 1993, S. 4.

ween Turkey and Germany was signed on 30.10.1961 but only after a revision of this agreement in 1964 did a substantial number of Turkish migrants come to Germany.⁹

Initially the recruitment of Turkish workers was seen as a temporary measure. The guest workers *Gastarbeiter* were expected to work in Germany for a certain period and to go back to their country of origin afterwards. However, this did not happen. It was in the interest of many Turkish work migrants to stay in Germany, but it was also in the interest of the German companies to keep those workers that had been trained on the job and not to replace them with new unskilled immigrants. The economic decline in Germany in the 1970s led to a recruitment stop in 1973, although the resident population increased after this date due to births and family reunions. The first generation worked mainly as unskilled labourers. In 1980, more than 50% of Turkish workers in Germany had had a school education of less than six years, whilst 14.6% of the female education had had no school education at all.¹⁰ In a survey of 168 Turkish migrants in Duisburg/ Germany, 21.4% had no school education and 51.2% only a primary school education. This survey also showed that more than 50% of the female immigrants had no knowledge of the German language.¹¹

In 1990 about 1.6 million Turkish migrants lived in Germany, 200,000 in France and 190,000 in the Netherlands. By 1992 the Turkish population in Germany had reached 1.8 million.¹² The latest available figure (Statistical Yearbook 2013) shows that there were 1.575.717 Turkish nationals in Germany in 2011. However, these statistics do not include Turkish nationals who obtained German nationality through naturalisation. Since 1990, the naturalisation of foreign nationals has been facilitated through new legislation but even prior to 1982, a small number of Turkish nationals had been naturalised. In total almost 800.000 (797,007) Turkish nationals obtained German citizenship between 1982 and 2011 (see Figure 1).

⁹ Mehrländer, Ursula: Rückkehrabsichten der Türken im Verlauf des Migrationsprozesses 1961-1985, in: Meys, Werner; Şen, Faruk (Hg.): *Zukunft in der Bundesrepublik oder Zukunft in der Türkei? Eine Bilanz der 25jährigen Migration der Türken (Future in Germany or in Turkey? An Overview of 25 Years of Turkish Migration)*, Frankfurt 1986 (Schriftenreihe des Zentrums für Türkeistudien, vol. 4), S. 53-72, hier S. 53.

¹⁰ Zentrum für Türkeistudien (Hg.): *Türkei-Sozialkunde*. Opladen 1984, S. 20.

¹¹ Ölçen, Ali N.: *Türken und Rückkehr* (Turks and remigration). Frankfurt 1986 (Zentrum für Türkeistudien, Studien und Arbeiten, vol 1), S. 53.

¹² Zentrum für Türkeistudien 1993, S. 19.




Figure 1

Naturalisation of Turkish nationals in Germany

(Own compilation based on Statistical Yearbook 1984 – 2013).¹³

The statistics do not reveal how many of these naturalised Turks live in Germany at present but it seems safe to estimate that the total number of Turkish nationals plus naturalised Turks in Germany is well beyond 2 million at the moment. Turkish migration to Germany went through different stages. Ölcen¹⁴ classifies all Turkish immigrants who were born before 1955 as the first generation, which means that at present there is not only a second and third generation in Germany but also potentially a fourth one. The first generation were mainly Turkish men; available figures about the gender structure from 1961 show that 5,512 male and 1,167 female Turkish immigrants came to Germany (Statistical Yearbook 1965). Since then the gender composition of the Tur-

¹³ The data for 2002 are estimates based on the previous and following year (rolling mean).

¹⁴ Ölcen: *Türken und Rückkehr*, S. 11.

kish population has approached a distribution similar to the general population. A turning point in the development can be identified in the mid 1970s when the steep increase of the female Turkish population in Germany began to flatten out as a gender distribution was reached that is similar to the present one (see Figure 2). This complements Ölçen's classification. We could define the second generation as those who were born in the mid 1970s in Germany, when Turkish nationals mostly lived in families rather than as solitary "guest workers". Figure 2 predicts a further rise of the female Turkish population although one has to be cautious with extrapolations of this kind.




Figure 2
Percentage of female Turkish nationals in Germany
(Own computation based on data from the Statistical Yearbook 1965 – 2013)

2.2 Migration from Germany to Turkey

Surveys from the mid 1980s reveal that many Turks in Germany expressed a wish to return to Turkey, but their actual behaviour shows that they stayed. They transferred less money back to Turkey and started to sell properties that they owned in Turkey.¹⁵ Nevertheless, the German and other European governments stimulated a re-migration to Turkey with financial incentives. The German government passed a law in 1983 to support re-migration to Turkey. This law allowed unemployed Turkish immigrants or those with short-term contracts to claim 10,500 Deutschmark + 1,500 Deutschmark for each child in the family if they returned to Turkey. According to Mehrländer¹⁶ 12,000 Turkish migrants accepted this offer, but the real number of re-migrants in 1984 was much higher. In 1984, 214,811 Turkish nationals went back to Turkey and only 34,547 emigrated from Turkey to Germany (Statistical Yearbook 1986). This means that in 1984 the net migration to Germany was negative, with almost 180,000 Turkish nationals leaving the country (see Figure 3). After the high return rates in the mid 1980s the net migration was again positive until 2008. Since then more Turkish nationals have returned to Turkey than did emigrate from there to Germany.

¹⁵ Zentrum für Türkeistudien 1984, S. 27.

¹⁶ Mehrländer: *Rückkehrabsichten*, S. 65.




Figure 3 Net-migration between Germany and Turkey

(Source: own computation on the basis of data from the Statistical Yearbook 1974 – 2013)

It is not known how many of these returnees were of school age. However, there are some data available about Turkish nationals in Germany under the age of 18 for the years 1976 to 1987 (see Figure 4)




Figure 4 Turkish nationals in Germany under the age of 18

(Own compilation based on data from the Statistical Yearbook 1974-1990)¹⁷

¹⁷ The data for 1975 are estimates based on the previous and following year (rolling mean).

Figure 4 shows a steady increase until 1982 and a decrease thereafter that reflects the data for net-migration from Figure 3. The number of those under the age of 18 fell from 650.500 in 1983 to 540.600 in 1985. A conservative estimate would be that around 90,000 Turkish nationals under 18 re-migrated to Turkey in the period from 1983 to 1995. Abali and Widmann¹⁸ estimate that around half of the re-migrants in 1984 alone were under 18, which would mean around 90,000 re-migrants under 18 in that year alone. Abali and Widmann's estimate is plausible as many returnees went back to Turkey without their parents to attend Turkish schools,¹⁹ a number which posed a challenge to the Turkish school system.

The question is what were the motives for Turkish nationals in returning to Turkey? Were they a special sub-group of those who were not successful in Germany or were they just a sample of the Turkish population in Germany? One reason for the re-migration that was mentioned quite often in the 1980s and 1990s were the opportunities for returnees to have a better school career in Turkey. According to Boos-Nünning²⁰ many children of Turkish background did not have a chance to attend schools that would lead to university education in Germany.²¹ Returnees, however, had free access to Anadolu Lisesi in Turkey that would prepare them for university entry. The re-migration to Turkey gave these students a chance to enter universities in Turkey. Stenzel and Homfeldt²² argue that there was an exaggerated expectation for advancement ("überhöhtes Aufstiegsbewusstsein") among this group. In a survey among 146 returnees in 1985, 56% of them said that the main reason for their return to Turkey was the opportunity to get a higher school degree in Turkey – a goal which, for them, was unattainable in Germany.²³ A typical comment of a returnee is:

¹⁸ Abali, Ünal; Widman, Horst: Zur Reintegration türkischer Migrantenkinder. Versuch einer Übersicht (Reintegration of Turkish children. An Overview). In: Steinig, Wolfgang (Hg.): *Zwischen den Stühlen. Schüler in ihrer fremden Heimat*, München, S. 17-37.

¹⁹ See Schäfer, Karl-Heinz: Sprach- und andere Probleme bei Schülern der deutschsprachigen Anadolu-Schulen (Language and other problems of pupils of the German-speaking Anadolu schools), in: Treffers-Daller, Jeanine; Daller, Helmut (Hg.): *Zwischen den Sprachen. Sprachgebrauch, Sprachmischung und Sprachfähigkeiten türkischer Rückkehrer aus Deutschland* (Between the languages, language use, language mixing and language proficiency of Turkish returnees from Germany), vol. 2, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, The Language Center Series, 1995, S. 47-56, hier S. 50.

²⁰ Boos-Nünning, Ursula: Kinder und Jugendliche ausländischer Herkunft in Bildung und Ausbildung (Children and young people of foreign origin in education and training), in: Treffers-Daller, Jeanine; Daller, Helmut (Hg.): *Zwischen den Sprachen*.

²¹ See also Daller: *Migration und Mehrsprachigkeit*.

²² Stenzel, Arnold.; Homfeldt, Hans G.: *Auszug in ein fremdes Land* (moving to a foreign country)? Weinheim u.a. 1985, S. 34.

²³ Stenzel; Homfeldt: *Auszug in ein fremdes Land*, S. 31.

"Aber wenn ich dort weiter zur Schule gegangen wäre, hätte (sic) ich bestimmt ein Fabrikarbeiter geworden" („but if I had stayed at school there (in Germany), I would probably become (sic) a factory worker.“²⁴

Another reason for the return to Turkey was the fear of some parents that their children would overly adapt to the German culture. Topraklar interviewed 18 families with 74 family members in 1984. The main reason given for their return was “Probleme der Kinder” (problems of the children).²⁵ A typical statement is:

"In der letzten Zeit konnte mein Mann nicht mehr arbeiten. Er war ständig krank. Wenn er nicht arbeitete, passte er auf die Kinder zu Hause auf. Dabei merkte er, dass unsere älteste Tochter (16 Jahre) öfter die Schule (Hauptschule) schwänzte und mit Jungen flirtete" (In the last years my husband could not work. He was ill most of the time. He was looking after the children. He noticed that our eldest daughter (16 years) frequently played truant and flirted with boys.”²⁶

The return to Turkey also brought social advancement for many parents of the returnees: over 18% of the adult returnees were able to gain self-employment.²⁷ There are, however, no data about the number of failed company foundations, although the number of failures was quite substantial.²⁸ Unemployment in Germany was not cited as a major reason for returning to Turkey. In a survey of 600 participants in 1991, only 8.3% claimed that unemployment in Germany was the main reason for returning to Turkey: "Many of the returnees were not under any immediate employment pressures. A significant part of the returnees obviously preferred to live on their savings or on their property proceeds."²⁹

²⁴ Ebd., S. 33.

²⁵ Topraklar, Hasan: *Zur Situation türkischer Rückkehrerfamilien. Ursache, Folgen, Probleme* (The situation of Turkish remigrant families – reasons, consequences and problems), Berlin: Fachhochschule für Sozialarbeit und Sozialpädagogik (Diplomarbeit), 1986, S. 20.

²⁶ Topraklar: *Zur Situation türkischer Rückkehrerfamilien*.

²⁷ Zentrum für Türkeistudien 1993, S. 54.

²⁸ Personal communication with a failed entrepreneur from Germany, 1992.

²⁹ Zentrum für Türkeistudien 1993, S. 61.

Since 2006, the net migration of Turks to Germany has been negative, in that there were more Turkish nationals going back to Turkey than immigrants entering Germany. The latest available figures for 2011 show that 32,576 Turkish nationals went back to Turkey and 31,021 immigrated to Germany (Statistical Yearbook 2013). Although there are no figures available for the age distribution, one can assume that even today thousands of children and young adults go back to Turkey each year and enter the Turkish school system.

The Turkish educational system has a longstanding tradition of teaching part or the entire curriculum in a foreign language at schools. The German High School “Alman Lisesi” was established in 1868³⁰ and the German-speaking Austrian High School “Sankt Georg Avusturya Lisesi” opened its doors in 1882.³¹ In 1955 the so-called Anatolian High Schools (Anadolu Lisesi) were established. Part of the curriculum at these schools is taught in a foreign language. The German and the Turkish governments signed a contract in 1986 to support the 10 German-speaking Anatolian High Schools with teachers from Germany (Legislative act 19259/ Resmi Gazete 1986), which was meant to support the transition of Turkish returnees from the German into the Turkish school system. It had been expected that the returnees would attend schools in the East of Turkey, because many of the original guest workers were recruited from this area. However, the vast majority entered Anatolian High Schools in West Turkey, mainly in Izmir and Istanbul.³² Access to these schools was made easy for returnees and this would have been an additional reason for some to return to Turkey. The Anatolian High Schools prepare for university entry, and therefore gave many returnees who would not have been able to enter university in Germany a chance to do so in Turkey.

³⁰ See Alman Lisesi URL.

³¹ See Avusturya Lisesi URL.

³² Schäfer: Sprach- und andere Probleme, S. 47.

3. The language proficiency of the returnees

3.1 Proficiency in German

Bilen and Develi (1995) investigate the language proficiency in German of returnees who went back to Turkey and studied German at a Turkish university. First of all they come to the conclusion that many of the students who were accepted at this Turkish university would not have gained access to German universities because of their low level of German proficiency. Around 50% of the participants in a study from 1992 (n = 48) did not pass the entry exam that would have been used in Germany (Kleines Deutsches Sprachdiplom). In a follow-up study two years later they come to the conclusion that the German proficiency of these students had not improved and that their vocabulary knowledge had diminished („verkümmert“)³³ due to lack of contact with German outside the classroom.

³³ Bilen and Devely: Sprachstandsanalyse S. 80.

Daller³⁴ investigates language attrition of German after return to Turkey on the basis of a cross-sectional study. Three groups of participants took part: a group of 40 returnee pupils (average age 12.65) who had just arrived from Germany in the year of the data collection (1994), a group of 35 returnee students who had been back already for seven years (average age 21) and a group of 20 Turkish-German bilinguals who were still living in Germany (average age 20.45). The term “heritage speakers” has been coined³⁵ for immigrants who stay in their host country but continue to speak their language of origin, sometimes over several generations, and in this sense the speakers of group three represent heritage speakers. The first group represents the stage at which the two student groups were at some point. They then developed in different linguistic environments, namely the returnee students in Turkey and the heritage speakers in Germany. In this study, Daller (1999) operationalizes language proficiency in German with verb morphology that is typical for written language (the in/correct use of the past tense, e.g.: „er geht“, * „er gehte“/ „he goes“, * “he goed“) and vowel change between first and third person singular in the present tense (e.g.: „ich nehme“, * „er nehmt“/≈ „I take“, * “he take“). The results show that the returnee pupils did not fully master this part of German verb morphology. They made mistakes in 8.7% of the cases. The heritage speakers in Germany made almost no mistakes (1.6% of the cases), but the returnee students made mistakes in 15.2% of the cases (the differences are significant, $\chi^2 = 20.183$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$, computations based on the raw scores). Daller comes to the conclusion that processes of language attrition might have taken place for the returnee students, perhaps due to insufficient input in German.

Daller and Grotjahn³⁶ investigate the everyday and academic language proficiency of returnees. Teachers and lecturers of returnees consistently report that the returnees’ command of German seems to be native-like at the surface level but their academic proficiency in German is deficient. A wide range of research data³⁷ confirms this assessment by the teachers. Daller and Grotjahn’s study is based on the theoretical framework of Jim Cummins. He analysed the language proficiency of migrant children in North America

³⁴ Daller: *Migration und Mehrsprachigkeit*, S. 134 ff.

³⁵ Montrul, Silvina.: *Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism. Re-examining the Age Factor*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins 2008; Rothman, Jason: Understanding the Nature and Outcomes of Early Bilingualism: Romance Languages as Heritage Languages, in: *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13 (2), 2009, S. 155-164.

³⁶ Daller, Helmut; Grotjahn, Rüdiger.: The Language Proficiency of Turkish Returnees from Germany. An Empirical Investigation of Academic and Everyday Language Proficiency, in: *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 12 (2), 1999, S. 156-172.

³⁷ For an overview see Reich, Hans H.: Forschungen zur türkisch-deutschen Zweisprachigkeit, in: Treffers-Daller, Jeanine; Daller Helmut (Hg.): *Zwischen den Sprachen*, S. 10-26.

and showed the existence of a discrepancy between seemingly native-like language proficiency at a surface level and poor academic language proficiency in comparison with their monolingual peers. Cummins developed a framework which distinguishes between *basic interpersonal skills* (BICS) and *cognitive-academic language proficiency* (CALP). Later he referred to this dichotomy also as *conversational and academic language proficiency*.³⁸

Daller and Grotjahn included 159 Turkish returnees and 10 learners of German as a foreign language in their study. All participants were university students of German philology at universities in Turkey at the time of the investigation (1993–1994). The average age of the returnees was about 20 and they had been back in Turkey for about seven years, which means that their average age at return was about 13. The returnees had either been born in Germany or had gone there when they were younger than three years old. The control group consisted of 10 Turkish university students of German philology, who had learned German as a foreign language in Turkey. They had only had contact with the target language inside the classroom, apart from a few short stays in Germany. Daller and Grotjahn used two gap-filling tests (C-tests) in their study, one text based on everyday German language and the other based on texts from German textbooks that were used at Turkish universities.³⁹ Some authors argue that the C-test as a written test cannot cover the BICS aspect of language proficiency because BICS are closely related to oral language use.⁴⁰ In order to avoid misinterpretations they therefore decided not to use the terms BICS and CALP but *everyday language proficiency (ELP)* and *academic language proficiency (ALP)*. The authors use factor analysis and the classical latent additive test model to show that there is an overlap between the two tests but that they also measured two different dimensions. The assumption that one test measures everyday language and the other academic language proficiency is therefore supported. The results show that, overall, the returnees have a higher proficiency in German than the foreign language learners, but this is mainly due to their scores in the everyday language test. They also have higher scores in the academic language tests but the differences between the two groups are far less pronounced here. Using multiple regression analysis, Daller

³⁸ See Cummins, Jim: Wanted. A Theoretical Framework for Relating Language Proficiency to Academic Achievement Among Bilingual Students, In: Rivera, Charlene (Hg.): *Communicative Competence Approaches to Language Proficiency Assessment. Research and Application*. Clevedon 1984. S. 2-19; Ders.: Interdependence of First- and Second-Language Proficiency in Bilingual Children, in: Bialystok, Ellen (Hg.): *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*, Cambridge 1991, S. 70-90.

³⁹ For an overview on the C-test format see Eckes, Thomas; Grotjahn, Rüdiger: A Closer Look at the Construct Validity of C-Tests, in: *Language Testing*, 23 (3), 2006, S. 290-325.

⁴⁰ See for instance Grotjahn, Rüdiger; Tönshoff, Wolfgang : Textverständnis bei der C-Test-Bearbeitung. Pilotstudien mit Französisch- und Italienischlernern, in: Grotjahn, Rüdiger (Hg.): *Der C-Test. Theoretische Grundlagen und praktische Anwendung* (Vol 1) (The C-test. Theoretical Foundations and Practical Applications), Bochum 1992, S. 19-95.

and Grotjahn show that the main factors that influence the level of language proficiency in German, even seven years after return, are the number of years attended at a German school before returning to Turkey and the type of school attended in Germany (Hauptschule/elementary school versus other secondary schools). The first factor has more influence on the everyday proficiency, the other more on the academic proficiency. The authors come to the conclusion that the language proficiency profile of the returnees in this study is characterized by an imbalance between everyday and academic language proficiency. This result confirms the impressions obtained from teachers of the returnees

3.2 Proficiency in Turkish

Many returnees state that they have problems with the Turkish language at school or university in Turkey. Quite often a lack of vocabulary knowledge in Turkish is identified by the returnees for problems in their academic career⁴¹ and a period of two years is mentioned before the returnees felt comfortable with Turkish.⁴² This is in line with studies reported by Cummins (1981) where an average of two years is reported until immigrants acquire the everyday language of the host country although this period may be much longer for the acquisition of academic language. However, the findings of Cummins with respect to immigrants might not be directly comparable to the returnees as they were in contact with Turkish from birth. The statement by many returnees that it took them two years after return to feel comfortable with Turkish in an academic context gives valuable insights into the development of bilingualism in a (re) migration setting.

A study carried out in 1994 with 50 returnees and 23 learners of German as a foreign language at an Anatolian High School in Istanbul reveals that the proficiency in Turkish and German of both groups was an almost exact mirror image.⁴³ In a gap-filling test in both languages (C-tests) returnees obtained higher scores in German than the foreign language learners, which was the expected outcome. However, in Turkish they had clearly lower scores than their monolingual classmates even on average 1.6 years after return. Daller and Yıldız (1995) carried out a similar second study with returnee students (n = 233) who had been back in Turkey for more than 8 years (mean age 21.9 at the time of the data collection) and their monolingual peers from the same

⁴¹ See Daller, Helmut; Yıldız, Cemal : Die türkischen Sprachfähigkeiten von Rückkehrern aus Deutschland (The Language Proficiency of Turkish Returnees from Germany), in: Treffers-Daller, Daller (Hg.): *Zwischen den Sprachen*, S. 83.

⁴² Daller; Yıldız: Die türkischen Sprachfähigkeiten, S. 84.

⁴³ Ebd.

university (n = 20). The C-test scores in Turkish are at the same level for both groups and the difference is statistically not significant. The returnee pupils were behind their monolingual peers after 1.6 years but the returnee students had reached a level comparable to that of their monolingual peers. It is not clear at which point between 1.6 and 8 years after remigration the monolingual level had been reached. Research on immigrants in North America showed that it took up to seven years for immigrant children to reach the level of monolinguals,⁴⁴ but one has to bear in mind that not all returnees reached the monolingual level. In the study of Daller and Yıldız there was a larger spread of scores for the returnees than for the monolinguals and a sub-group of the returnees showed clearly lower scores in Turkish than the average score of monolinguals.

Treffers-Daller, Daller, Furman and Rothman (under review) investigate whether there are differences in the grammatical system in Turkish between Turkish-German bilinguals in Germany, returnees and monolingual Turks in Turkey. The Turkish-German bilinguals who are in Germany already in the second or third generation can be described as heritage speakers.⁴⁵ Heritage speakers normally have no or only little support for their first language at school and the input is often restricted to oral contact, so they feel that their written proficiency in the heritage language is low.⁴⁶ Montrul and Bowles⁴⁷ consider this to be a case of “incomplete acquisition” of the heritage language which leads to a simplification of the grammar.⁴⁸ The interesting question in the given context is whether the returnees converge towards the monolingual norm upon return and whether their ultimate attainment of the Turkish grammatical system after several years back in Turkey brings them to a level comparable to the monolingual norm.

The participants in this study comprise three groups: Turkish heritage speakers who stayed in Germany (n = 49), Turkish returnees (n = 48) and Turkish monolinguals (n = 68). For each group we have two sub-groups of secondary school students and university students. The returnees at secondary schools in

⁴⁴ Cummins, J.: Interdependence of first- and second-language proficiency in bilingual children, in: Bialystok: *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*, S. 70-90.

⁴⁵ See Montrul: *Incomplete Acquisition in Bilingualism.*; Rothman : Understanding the Nature and Outcomes of Early Bilingualism. Romance Languages as Heritage Languages, in: *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 13 (2), 2009, S. 155-164.

⁴⁶ See Daller, Helmut.: The Academic Language Proficiency of Turkish Returnees from Germany. Language, in: *Culture and Curriculum*, 8 (2), 1995, S. 163-173; Daller, Grotjahn: The Language Proficiency of Turkish Returnees from Germany.

⁴⁷ Montrul, Silvina, Bowles, Melissa: Back to Basics: Differential Object Marking under Incomplete Acquisition in Spanish Heritage Speakers, in: *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 12 (4), 2009, S. 363-383, hier S. 381.

⁴⁸ See also Treffers-Daller, Jeanine; Özsoy, Sumru; van Hout, Roeland: (In)complete Acquisition of Turkish among Turkish-German Bilinguals in Germany and Turkey. An Analysis of Complex Embeddings in Narratives, in: *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 10 (3), 2007, S. 248-276.

Turkey were 16.58 years old on average at the time of the data collection and had been back in Turkey for just one year. The returnees at Turkish universities were on average 20.8 years old and had been back in Turkey for seven years. The two sub-groups of heritage speakers in Germany and the two groups of monolinguals in Turkey were of a similar age as their peers in the returnee subgroups and had always stayed in the same linguistic environment. The fact that both groups of returnees went back to Turkey after puberty makes this group very interesting from the perspective of theories of second language acquisition which show that acquiring formulaic sequences⁴⁹ is very difficult for second language learners after the age of twelve.⁵⁰ It has been known since at least the 1980s that Turkish as spoken in Europe by immigrant children from Turkey differs from Turkish as spoken in Turkey with respect to a range of morphosyntactic and lexical features.⁵¹ One phenomenon that has been noticed across diaspora varieties of Turkish in Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and France is the prolific use of the verb “yap-” (“to do”) in fixed expressions such as “hareket yap-“ (to move) or “fotoğraf yap-“ (to take picture), where “hareket et-“ (to move) and “fotoğraf çek-“ (to take picture) would generally be used by monolingual speakers in Turkey. Generally, heritage speakers prefer “yap-” in a range of constructions, whereas “et-” (also “to do”) is more frequent among monolingual Turks.⁵² It is beyond the scope of this short summary to explain in detail in which grammatical contexts these two verbs are used (we refer to Treffers-Daller et al., under review, for details). The results of Treffers-Daller et al. show that the younger group of returnees use more et- after only one year after their return. They also use some hypercorrect forms, which may be interpreted as an over-adaptation to the new linguistic environment in Turkey, although this is hard to prove empirically. The student returnees who had

⁴⁹ Wray, Alison: *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*, Cambridge 2002.

⁵⁰ Durrant, Phil; Schmitt, Norbert: Adult Learners' Retention of Collocations from Exposure, in: *Second Language Research* (2010), Nr. 26, S.163-188; Foster, Pauline: Lexical Diversity and Native-Like Selection: The Bonus of Studying Abroad. In: Richards, Brian; Daller, Michael H.; Malvern, David D.; Meara, Paul; Milton, James; Treffers-Daller, Jeanine (Hg.): *Vocabulary Studies in First and Second Language Acquisition*, Houndmills 2009, S. 91-106.

⁵¹ Boeschoten, Hendrik E.: *Acquisition of Turkish by Immigrant Children: A Multiple Case Study of Turkish Children in the Netherlands Aged 4 to 6*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1990; Fritsche, Michael.: Beobachtungen zum deutsch-türkischen Bilingualismus (German-Turkish Bilingualism). In: *Zeitschrift für Türkeistudien*, 9 (1), 1996, S. 5-17; Pfaff, Carol W.: Turkish in Contact with German: Language Maintenance and Loss among Immigrant Children in West Berlin, in: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (90), 1991, S. 97-129; Rehbein, Jochen: *Sprachloyalität in der Bundesrepublik? Ausländische Kinder zwischen Sprachverlust und zweisprachiger Erziehung*", Universität Hamburg: Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit 26, 1987; Schaufeli, Anneli: *Turkish in an Immigrant Setting. A Comparative Study of the First Language of Monolingual and Bilingual Turkish Children*, Dissertation, University of Amsterdam. 1991; Verhoeven, Ludo Th., Hendrik Boeschoten: "First Language Acquisition in a Second Language Submersion Environment, in: *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 1986, S. 241-256.

⁵² See also Türker, Emel: *Turkish-Norwegian Code-Switching. Evidence from Intermediate and Second Generation Turkish Immigrants in Norway*, Oslo 2000; Pfaff, Carol W.: Turkish in contact with German: language maintenance and loss among immigrant children in Berlin, in: *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 1991, S. 97-129.

been exposed to the monolingual Turkish environment for more than seven years are no longer distinguishable from the monolingual Turkish speakers with regard to their use of “et-” versus “yap-”. The authors conclude that for Turkish-German bilinguals, convergence towards the monolingual norm is possible even after puberty. Thus, they argue, the competence of the returnees is different from that of second language learners, for whom learning fixed expressions is virtually impossible after the age of twelve.

3.3. Comparing the proficiency in both languages

The studies reported so far suggest the returnees’ bilingual profile is characterized by a contrasting development of their proficiency in both languages. After return to Turkey, the Turkish proficiency of the returnees develops in the direction of Turkish as spoken in Turkey to a point where many are indistinguishable from those who have grown up with Turkish only, whereas their German proficiency is marked by attrition even when this language is supported by bilingual schools and by university programmes. For the heritage speakers, the opposite is the case as was shown in the following study on how the linguistic biography of Turkish-German bilinguals influences their oral proficiency in both languages. Daller, van Hout and Treffers-Daller⁵³ focus on this question by comparing a group of returnees in Turkey with a group of Turkish-German bilinguals in Germany. All participants in this study were either born in Germany or immigrated to Germany at a very young age. One group (the German group) consists of 25 young adults (average age 20) who were students at a college in Germany at the time of the investigation (1993). They went through the German school system and entered Higher Education in Germany. The other bilingual group (the returnees) consists of 28 Turkish-German bilinguals who attended German schools up to the age of 13 on average, after which they returned to Turkey. At the time of the investigation (1992) they were of the same age as the German group (average age 20) and had been back in Turkey for seven years. One can assume that they had a similar oral proficiency level in both languages at the age of 13 when both groups lived in Germany and attended schools there, but that the different exposure to German and Turkish after the re-migration of the returnees led to different bilingual profiles. Daller, van Hout and Treffers-Daller analyse these profiles with measures of lexical richness of semi-spontaneous speech production. Whilst most studies in bilingualism concentrate on the analysis of lexical richness in one language only, this study compares lexical richness in both languages of the returnees although this adds to the complexity of the

⁵³ Daller, Helmut; van Hout, Roeland; Treffers-Daller, Jeanine: Lexical richness in spontaneous speech of bilinguals, in: *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (2), 2003, S. 197-222.

task since typological differences between the languages have to be taken into account. Many researchers on immigrant bilinguals in Europe are faced with the problem of comparing proficiency in language pairs with large structural differences (e.g. Dutch/Arabic or German/Turkish). Daller, van Hout and Treffers-Daller propose solutions to overcome these structural problems when comparing scores of bilinguals in both of their languages. All subjects were asked to describe two so-called "father-and-son-stories" (Plauen 1986) in German and two other stories in Turkish. These descriptions were audio-recorded and transcribed. The average number of words in the German descriptions was 227.64 (SD = 87.29); the average in the Turkish descriptions was 159.74 (SD = 59.96). The difference in text length between the two languages can be explained, for the most part, by the typological differences between the two languages, where Turkish as an agglutinating language typically uses fewer but morphologically more complex words for the description of the same situation than German. Daller, van Hout and Treffers-Daller propose a new measure of lexical richness to analyse these oral data: "Guiraud Advanced". Earlier research of Arnaud (1984) and Linnarud⁵⁴ shows that the use of rare words in written compositions is an indicator of a high level of language proficiency. The occurrence of rare words allows for discrimination between essays written by foreign language learners and native speakers, as illustrated in the following examples from Meara and Bell.⁵⁵ Intuitively there is a clear difference between speakers who describe the same picture with the words "the man saw the woman", a sentence which consist of very basic words only, and those who describe this picture with the words "the bishop observed the actress", which contains more advanced or rare words. Traditional measures of lexical richness, such as the index of⁵⁶ would yield a similar score for both sentences. Guiraud's index simply divides the number of new words (types) by the square root of the total number of words (tokens). The square root is part of this formula to compensate for differences in text length but each new word (type) has equal weight in this formula. The new proposed measure "Guiraud Advanced", however, takes the frequency or rareness of words into account and uses the same formula but replaces "types" by "advanced types" as defined by word frequency lists (for German) and teachers judgements (for Turkish) since no appropriate frequency lists for Turkish were available at the time. In order to make the scores for "Guiraud Advanced" comparable in both measures, Daller, van Hout and Treffers-Daller standardise their

⁵⁴ Linnarud, Moira : *Lexis in Composition. A Performance Analysis of Swedish Learners' Written English*, Malmö 1986 (Lund Studies in English 74).

⁵⁵ Meara, P.; Bell, H.: P Lex: A simple and effective way of describing the lexical characteristics of short L2 texts. In: *Prospect* 16 (3), 2001. S. 5-19, hier S. 6.

⁵⁶ Guiraud, Pierre: *Les caractères statistiques du vocabulaire*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France 1954

scores in both languages by computing z-scores. This compensates for the differences in text lengths that are due to structural differences in both languages and gives a more reliable picture of the oral proficiency of both groups. The z-scores for “Guiraud” and “Guiraud Advanced” show the same picture. As expected, the German group scores higher in German and lower in Turkish in comparison to the returnees. Thus, both measures accurately reflect the language acquisition history of both groups. However, “Guiraud Advanced” which takes the rareness of words into account reveals the differences much more clearly than the traditional index of Guiraud. The reason for the advantage of the advanced measures is the fact that they include additional information that is not available with purely quantitative measures. Apart from these methodological implications, the study of Daller, van Hout and Treffers-Daller (2003) shows an important aspect of bilingual proficiency development. Bilingual language proficiency is fluid and changes over time, depending on the frequency with which bilinguals make use of both languages. We believe it is reasonable to assume that both groups had the same level of proficiency in both languages when they still lived in Germany but that changes in their bilingual biographies resulted in the development of different bilingual profiles over time.

The identification of the dominant language, however, is a huge methodological problem, especially in studies of structurally different languages.⁵⁷ Most researchers agree that a balanced bilingual with equal proficiency in both languages is seldom found in real life and that there is almost always a dominant language.⁵⁸ This is because bilinguals usually use their languages, for different purposes and in different domains, for which Grosjean⁵⁹ coined the notion “complementary principle”. Bilingual children are normally more exposed to one language, usually the language of the dominant environment, and they need to use this language, e.g. in school, more than the other. Many will therefore develop a stronger and a weaker language in each of those different domains. This is true even for children who are exposed to two languages simultaneously from a very early age.⁶⁰ The identification of the dominant language remains a huge

⁵⁷ see Daller, H., van Hout, R., and Treffers-Daller, J.: Lexical richness in spontaneous speech of bilinguals, in: *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (2), 2003, 197-222; Treffers-Daller et al. under review.

⁵⁸ e.g. Grosjean, F.: *Life with Two Languages*. Cambridge. Harvard University Press, 1982; Olsson, Åsa; Sullivan, Kirk P.H.: Provoking Dominance Shift in a Bilingual Swedish-American English 4-Year-Old Child, In: Cohen, James, McAlister, Kara, Rolstad, Kellie; MacSwan, Jeff (Hg.). *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*, S. 1750-1764, Somerville, MA: Cascidilla Press, 2005

⁵⁹ Grosjean, F.: The Bilingual Individual, in: *Interpreting: International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting*, (1-2), 1997, 163-187, hier S. 165.

⁶⁰ See Bosch, Laura; Sebastián-Gallés, Nuria: Early Differentiation in Bilingual Infants, in: Cenoz, Jasone; Genesee Fred (Hg.): *Trends in Bilingual Acquisition*, Amsterdam: 2001, S. 71-93, hier S. 73.

methodological problem, especially in studies of structurally different languages.⁶¹ Simple judgments about the dominance pattern between the two or more languages of a bilingual might or might not be valid but what is needed are objective measures that can be replicated which would make it possible to compare the findings of different (see also the discussion on the need for objective measures in the article by Daller, Yıldız, De Jong, Kan and Başbağı).⁶² Various tools have been developed to allow comparisons between different languages⁶³ but to our knowledge no such measure is based on the analysis of oral fluency. In Daller, et al. (2011) the focus is on language dominance of returnees as defined by measures of fluency in Turkish and German. Fluency and related aspects of oral proficiency are good candidates for the analysis of language dominance for theoretical and for practical reasons. From a theoretical viewpoint, fluency can give insight into the level of automaticity in a given language and therefore insights into the structure of underlying processing of language.⁶⁴ An analysis of aspects of fluency of the two languages of a bilingual therefore has the potential to reveal structural differences between the proficiency in both languages and can be a good indicator of language dominance. From a practical point of view, the measurement of fluency might be the right step forward as more and more automated measures are under development and time-consuming transcriptions might not be necessary in the near future.⁶⁵ This will enable researchers to carry out studies with much larger samples than are currently typical and will certainly further our insight into bilingual proficiency. The definition of fluency is difficult and varies across different contexts.⁶⁶ For the layperson, somebody is fluent when s/he speaks a language at a native or near-native level. In this case fluency be-

⁶¹ See Daller, H.; van Hout, R.; Treffers-Daller, J.: Lexical Richness in Spontaneous Speech of Bilinguals, in: *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (2), 2003, S. 197-222; Treffers-Daller, Jeanine; Daller, Michael; Furman, Rehan; Rothman, Jason: *Native-Like Selection among Heritage Speakers of Turkish in German* (under review).

⁶² Daller, Michael; Yıldız, Cemal; De Jong, Nivia; Kan, Seda; Başbağı, Ragıp: Language Dominance in Turkish German Bilinguals: Methodological Aspects of Measurements in Structurally Different Languages, in: Daller, Michael H. (Hg): *The Measurement of Bilingual Proficiency. Special Issue 2011. The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15 (2), 2011, S. 215-236.

⁶³ Daller: *Migration und Mehrsprachigkeit*; Daller et al.: Lexical Richness; Treffers-Daller, Özsoy, van Hout: (In)complete acquisition among Turkish-German bilinguals in Germany and Turkey; Daller, Michael H.; Treffers-Daller, Jeanine; Furman, Rehan: Conceptual Transfer in Narratives by Turkish-German Bilinguals: The Description of Motion Events in Turkish and German. *Bilingualism, Language and Cognition*. 2011, S. 95-119.

⁶⁴ See Segalowitz, Norman: Automaticity and Second Languages, in: Doughty, Catherine; Long, Michael H. (Hg.): *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford 2003, S. 382-408.

⁶⁵ De Jong, Nivia H.; Wempe, Ton: Praat Script to Detect Syllable Nuclei and Measure Speech Rate Automatically, in: *Behaviour Research Methods*, 41 (2), 2009, S. 385-390.

⁶⁶ See Chambers, Francine: What Do We Mean by Fluency?, in: *System*, 25 (4), 1997, S. 535-544; Hilton, Heather: The Link between Vocabulary Knowledge and Spoken L2 Fluency, in: *Language Learning Journal*, 36 (2), 2008, S. 136-166.

comes interchangeable with oral proficiency. In communicative language teaching, fluency is quite often opposed to accuracy and is seen as a feature of performance rather than knowledge. For researchers in second language acquisition fluency is, however, only one component of oral proficiency. There seems to be general agreement that automaticity is closely related to the concept of fluency. According to Schmidt⁶⁷ “fluency in speech production is automatic procedural skill”. Segalowitz⁶⁸ also relates the concepts of fluency and automaticity in performance and points out that it is not the mere speed of speech that characterizes automatic processes but that automaticity “refers to a significant change in the way processing is carried out”. The restructuring of underlying processes during second language acquisition may, however, lead to a higher speech rate in more advanced learners. Wood⁶⁹ sees automaticity and formulaic competence as the two main components of fluency.

The participants in this study of Daller, Yıldız, De Jong, Kan and Başbağı (2011) were two groups of pupils from an Anadolu High School in Istanbul. One group of 60 returnees (average age of 16.58) who had been back to Turkey for one year and one group of 55 Turkish pupils (average age 15.35) from the same school who grew up in Turkey and learned German as an L2. Two different types of data were collected in this study: C-tests in both languages and narratives in both languages. The narratives were transcribed and analysed in two ways. They were analysed manually according to the number of types and tokens per minute using the programme “Cool Edit 2002”, and they were analysed with a variety of fluency measures with the computer programme PRAAT.⁷⁰ The results of the C-tests show once more a typical mirror image. The returnees achieve much higher scores in German than the foreign language learners (control group) but much lower scores than the control group in Turkish. Figure 5 shows the results for German and Figure 6 for Turkish.

⁶⁷ Schmidt, Richard: Psychological Mechanisms underlying Second Language Fluency, in: *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* (14), 1992, S. 357-385, hier S. 358.

⁶⁸ Automaticity and Second Languages, S. 313.

⁶⁹ Wood, David: In Search of Fluency. What is it and How can we Teach it?, in: *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes* 57(4), 2001, S. 573-589.

⁷⁰ For a discussion on automated syllable detection with PRAAT see De Jong, Wempe: *Praat script*.




Figure 5 C-test scores for German (in percent)




Figure 6 C-test scores for Turkish (in percent)

The differences between the groups are both significant (t-test for German: $t = 13.342$, $df = 90.519$ $p < .001$, equal variance not assumed; for Turkish: $t = 15.223$, $df = 114$, $p < .001$, equal variance assumed). The control group is clearly dominant in Turkish which is in line with expectations. The C-test results make it likely that for the returnees, German is still the dominant language. We first compared fluency differences between the groups only within each language. The returnees produce significantly more words in German than the control group ($t = 5.732$, $df = 33$, $p < .001$) but for Turkish the differences between the groups are not significant. More important than the actual scores (number of words) for the determination of language dominance, is the relationship between the scores in the two languages. The difference between the scores for the returnees leads to a value for η^2 of .499 which is much higher than the value for the control group ($\eta^2 = .125$). In order to find a measure of language dominance, we first computed the difference between the scores in each language for each group based on the raw scores in both languages. This new variable “difference in scores” was then used to predict group membership. With a discriminant analysis, up to 91.4 % of the participants could be correctly classified as either being returnees or foreign language learners.

This analysis allows us to determine that the two groups have a clearly different language dominance profile, which is in line with the expectation given the different language acquisition history of the groups. The control group is clearly dominant in Turkish but the returnees are dominant in German even one year after return to Turkey.

One question that is always related to research on bilingualism is the relation between language and thought. It is beyond the scope of the present chapter to discuss this in full detail but we would like to draw attention to a recent publication by Daller, Treffers-Daller and Furman⁷¹ on Turkish-German bilinguals. Their study is based on the theoretical framework for conceptual transfer outlined in Jarvis and Pavlenko⁷²

⁷¹ Daller; Treffers-Daller; Furman; Conceptual transfer in narratives.

⁷² Jarvis, Scott; Pavlenko, Aneta: *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*, New York et al. 2008.

and on the typology of languages developed by Talmy⁷³ and Slobin.⁷⁴ The study by Daller et al. includes a variety of bilingual and monolingual speakers with different exposure to Turkish and German: Two groups of heritage speakers in Germany (one group of 20 university students, mean age = 21.1; and one group of 29 school pupils, mean age = 14.9) are compared with a group of 35 returnee students who had been back in Turkey for more than 7 years (mean age 20.8), two groups of monolingual German speakers (30 pupils, mean age 13.7; 23 pupils, mean age 15.65) and two groups of monolingual Turkish speakers resident in Turkey (40 pupils, mean age 13.2, and 28 students, mean age 20.7). This design makes it possible to draw a fine-grained picture of linguistic preferences for the description of motion events and how these events are conceptualized by the different groups in this study. The authors first establish a monolingual norm for German and Turkish, e.g. how a certain narrative is described with regard to a motion event (e.g. focusing on the movement as such or focusing on the end-point of the movement of a figure climbing down a man-hole to fetch a ball). The study clearly shows that there are different monolingual preferences in the conceptualization of these movements which are in line with the existing literature: Monolingual speakers of German prefer the expression of an end-point (confirmation component) whereas monolingual speakers of Turkish do not. Returnees in Turkey tend more towards monolingual Turkish preferences, whilst heritage speakers in Germany tend more towards German preferences in both (!) of their languages. German preferences are used in the description of motion events in Turkish by heritage speakers in Germany whereas Turkish preferences are used more by returnees in Turkey in their German narratives. None of these narratives violates the grammatical structure of the language used but they show preferences in the description of narratives that are influenced by the other language of the bilinguals, but they illustrate that the motion event descriptions of bilinguals are somewhere in between the typical ways in which monolinguals describe

⁷³ Talmy, Leonard: Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms, in: Shopen, Timothy (Hg.): *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon. Volume III of Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Cambridge 1985, S. 57-149. Talmy, Leonard: Path Realization. A Typology of Event Conflation, in: *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 1991, S. 480-519. Talmy, Leonard: *Toward a Cognitive Semantics* (Vol. I): *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Concepts Structuring Systems*. Cambridge, MA 2000; Ders.: *Toward a Cognitive Semantics* (Vol. II): *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*, Cambridge, MA, 2000.

⁷⁴ Slobin, Dan I.: Thinking for Speaking, in: *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 1987, S. 435-444. Ders.: From "Thought and Language" to "Thinking to Speaking", in: Gumperz, John J.; Levinson, Stephen C. (Hg.). *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*, Cambridge: 1996. S. 70-96. Ders.: Language and Thought Online. Cognitive Consequence of Linguistic Relativity, in: Gentner, Dedre; Goldin-Meadow, Susan (Hg.): *Language in Mind. Advances in the Study of Language and Thought*, Cambridge, MA, 2003, S. 157-192; Ders.: Linguistic Representation in Motion Events. What is Signifier and what is Signified, in: Maeder, Costantino; Fisher, Olgo; Herlofsky, William (Hg.): *Iconicity inside out. Iconicity in Language and Literature* Amsterdam (Philadelphia), 2005, S. 307-322. Ders.: What makes Manner of Motion Salient? Explorations in Linguistic Typology, Discourse, and Cognition, in: Hickmann, Maya; Robert, Stephane (Hg.): *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*, Amsterdam (Philadelphia), 2006, S. 59-81.

the same events Daller, Treffers-Daller, and Furman⁷⁵ conclude that this is the case because the two languages of the bilingual participants influence each other at an underlying conceptual level.

4. Conclusions

In the present chapter we have given an overview of various aspects of the bilingual proficiency of the returnees and compared them either with monolingual speakers of Turkish and German or with bilingual heritage speakers who grew up with Turkish and German, in Germany, but never returned to Turkey for a longer period. The large number of migrants between Turkey and Germany (and other European countries) over more than 50 years makes the Turkish-German bilingual experience of particular importance for research in bilingualism, because it allows researchers to compare the language profiles of large groups of bilinguals with different migration histories. The fact that many migrants go back to Turkey and change their linguistic environment during their language development several times gives valuable insights into the fluidity of bilingual proficiency. In this light, it is surprising that not many more large-scale studies on the returnees have been carried out so far. As stated earlier, the reason for this might be a logistical problem in tracing returnees in Turkey but it might also be the result of a bias in that researchers are more inclined to focus on immigrants in Western European countries (who are easily found) than on those who have “disappeared” into Turkish society and are not easily traceable. Nevertheless, the large re-migration, especially in the 1980ies would have provided the opportunity to study this group on a much larger scale than has been done.

Many studies discussed in this chapter show a mirror image of the proficiency of the groups compared with a stronger (dominant) and a weaker language. This confirms the general view of many studies on bilingualism where “balanced” bilinguals are seldom found in real life.⁷⁶ Returnees have lower scores in proficiency tests for Turkish when compared with monolinguals, but higher scores when compared with foreign language learners of German in Turkey. They are, in general, dominant in German when they return to Turkey. This dominance gradually changes and returnee students, seven years or more after return, do not show significant differences in Turkish from their monolingual peers. This holds not only for general

⁷⁵ Daller, Treffers-Daller, Furman: *Conceptual transfer in narratives*.

⁷⁶ See Grosjean, François: *Life with Two Languages*. Cambridge, 1982.

Olsson, Åsa; Sullivan, Kirk P.H.: Provoking Dominance Shift in a Bilingual Swedish-American English 4-Year-Old Child, in: Cohen, James; McAllister, Kara; Rolstad, Kellie; MacSwan, Jeff (Hg.): *Proceedings of the 4. International Symposium on Bilingualism*, Somerville, MA, 2005, S. 1750-1764.

proficiency tests but also for in-depth analysis of more complex formulaic sequences in Turkish.⁷⁷ These findings are reassuring in the sense that returnees can reach proficiency levels in Turkish that are comparable to their monolingual peers. The studies therefore show that returnees are different from second language learners because they can still learn formulaic sequences after the age of twelve, which is virtually impossible for second language learners who start learning a language after puberty. One has to bear in mind, however, that the returnees had already had Turkish input in Germany, although this was mainly oral and there was little support for Turkish at school level. In summary, research on returnees and Turkish-German bilinguals can give valuable new insights into many aspects of bilingualism, such as how language dominance can change over time, and how this is related to changes in the patterns of usage of both languages, as well as how language influences cognition in bilinguals. A promising way forward for future research also lies in the comparison of findings from Turkish-German returnees with other similar bilingual biographies.

⁷⁷ See Treffers-Daller; J. Daller, M.; Furman, R., Rothman, J.: *Native-like Selection among Heritage Speakers of Turkish in German* (under review).