



**MULTILINGUALISM AND
IDENTITIES ACROSS
CONTEXTS**

**CROSS-DISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES ON
TURKISH-SPEAKING YOUTH IN EUROPE**

EDITED BY
VALLY LYTRA & J. NORMANN JØRGENSEN



**COPENHAGEN STUDIES IN BILINGUALISM
UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
2008**

**VOLUME
45**

Table of Contents

- Multilingualism and Identities Across Contexts: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Turkish-Speaking Youth in Europe**
by Vally Lytra & J. Normann Jørgensen
page 5
- Language Practices, Language Ideologies and Identity Construction in London Turkish Complementary Schools**
by Vally Lytra & Taşkın Baraç *with* Angela Creese, Arvind Bhatt, Adrian Blackledge, Shahela Hamid, Li Wei, Peter Martin, Chao-Jung Wu, Dilek Yağcıoğlu-Ali
page 15
- Polylingual Behavior in Different Life Stages**
by Janus Møller
page 44
- Identity, Timescales and Children's Multimodal Texts**
by Kate Pahl
page 60
- Language Use and Biliteracy Practices of Turkish-speaking children and adolescents in France**
by Mehmet-Ali Akinci
page 85
- The Hand and the Glove: Code and Style as Bilingual Options Among Young People of Turkish and Moroccan Descent in the Netherlands**
by Margreet Dorleijn & Jacomine Nortier
page 109
- Poly-Lingual Languageing. Evidence from Turkish-Speaking Youth**
by J. Normann Jørgensen
page 129

**Multiculturalism and Inter-Group Dynamics:
Language, Culture, and the Identity of Turkish-Speaking
Youth in the UK**
by Tözün İssa

page 151

**Linguistic Variation, Style of Communication, and Social
Identity: Case Study of a Migrant Youth Group in
Mannheim, Germany**
by Inken Keim

page 178

LANGUAGE USE AND BILITERACY PRACTICES OF TURKISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS IN FRANCE

Mehmet-Ali Akinci

Introduction

Bilingualism cannot be examined solely in relation to language itself, but must always be viewed within the wider societal context and with a specific understanding of the particular circumstances of the language communities in question, Hamers & Blanc (1983), Baker (2001). Recent developments in sociolinguistics have focused on the relationship between the language users' range of different linguistic resources and their identities, Rampton (1995), Lytra (2006), Androutsopoulos (2007). Most research appears to concentrate on a number of particular instances of language contact in two types of contexts: i) in long-established contact situations and ii) in newly established populations, who settled in industrial urban areas largely as a result of labour migration, Dabène & Moore (1995). This paper investigates the second case and deals with language use and biliteracy practices of second generation Turkish-French bilingual children and adolescents in France. The bilinguals' language and biliteracy practices are also compared to those of their French and Turkish monolingual peers. Through the examination of these practices, I discuss bilinguals' biliterate competencies.

Literacy is defined as the ability to encode information in messages delivered in the written mode, Street (1993), Durgunoğlu & Verhoeven (1998), Jaffré (2004). This definition should be extended because as new information and communication technologies appear rapidly and continuously, new literacies also emerge (e.g. internet use, SMS etc.). As Leu (2002) argues,

new literacies include the skills, strategies, and insights necessary to successfully exploit the rapidly changing information and communication technologies that continuously emerge in our world.

In every society, literacy has a powerful status and is perceived as a tool enhancing economic, social and political opportunities for the individual, Datta (2000), Baker (2001). This is particularly true, as Baker (2001, 320) claims,

where language minority members are relatively powerless and under privileged, literacy is often regarded as a major key to self-advancement as well as community group and individual empowerment.

The changing demography of industrialized countries makes it critical to understand literacy-related abilities of young people from immigrant families whose home cultures and languages differ from those of the mainstream school system, Extra & Yağmur (2004). Indeed, language practices of immigrant families evolve as they settle in the host country and as children grow. Often parents may adapt themselves to this new situation which raises many questions as far as the maintenance of home language and cultural practices are concerned.

In the context of a research project on text production abilities as an indicator of literacy across and beyond school ages of Turkish-French bilingual and French and Turkish monolingual children and adolescents, Akinci (2006), we designed a detailed and individually tailored literacy related questionnaire. Our focus in this paper is on the results of this questionnaire which constitutes a source of information on demographic variables, language practices with siblings and literacy-related activities outside schools. A total of 277 participants ranging across four age groups (10-11 year old primary school pupils, 12-13 year old junior high school pupils, 15-16 year old high school pupils and students from university) of Turkish-French bilingual, Turkish monolingual and French monolingual backgrounds

were asked to fill out the questionnaire. The data allowed us to answer the following questions with regard to the French-Turkish bilingual children:

1. What are the characteristics of these bilinguals, their language use and the different contexts in which this occurs?
2. What kinds of literacy practices do French-Turkish bilingual children engage outside school?

In this paper, first, we discuss different theories of bilingualism with special reference to immigrant children and give a short description of the Turkish immigrant community in France. Then, we describe our methodology, introducing the characteristics of the investigated population and the questionnaire. In the third part, we present some of our most significant results. After presenting the Turkish-French young peoples' language choices across different interlocutors in France and in Turkey, we analyze in comparative perspective their literacy practices with those of their French monolingual and Turkish monolingual peers. Since this is work in progress, our discussion of the findings will be tentative.

Bilingualism and children with immigrant background

In the last three decades, one of the most influential theories in the field of language contact was doubtless the ethnolinguistic vitality theory developed by Giles and his colleagues, Giles, Bourhis & Taylor (1977). According to this theory, the language and culture of origin tend to undergo changes in situations of contact, and their maintenance is conditioned by several factors. The factors involved are generally divided into two categories: those affecting a speech community and those affecting individuals within a speech community, Kipp, Clyne & Pauwels (1995). However, it is not always easy to draw the line between individual and societal factors as there is an ongoing interaction between an individual and the speech community. In the

majority of cases, these factors are interdependent; see also Akinci (2003).

Since the first studies of Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukoma (1976), which showed that there was a direct relation between a child's competence in his first language and his or her competence in the second language, numerous studies have been carried out to confirm these findings. For instance, Cummins (1979) showed that poor development of skills in the first language will hinder progress in the second language, both in quantity and in quality. Thus, one will put at risk the cultural identity and linguistic development of migrant children who are schooled "by immersion" in the language of the host country and who are being urged to give up their home language following the principles of assimilation policies, see also Cummins (1991).

As discussed by Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukoma (1976) and Haugen (1977) some theories on bilingualism do not hesitate to classify children with an immigration background as semilinguals who not only confuse and mix both languages but also share with second language learners the instability of their skills, as indicated by restricted vocabulary, faulty grammar, hesitation in production and difficulties in expression in both languages. The study conducted by Gonzo & Saltarelli (1983) concerning immigrant families advances the idea that linguistic and cultural attrition can take years with first generation immigrants. Children belonging to the second generation acquire a weakened language and culture of origin. These languages and cultures are in their turn transmitted in an even weaker form to a third generation. Influenced by a follow-up effect, the authors argue that in three or four generations, the languages and cultures of migrant children who are in contact with the language and culture of the host environment may have become extinct, on this subject see also Thomason & Kaufman (1988), Lüdi & Py (2003).

Turkish immigrants in France

The immigration history of the Turkish community in France is the shortest compared to other immigrant communities. The Turkish population arrived to France mainly in the 1970s. In most cases, Turks came to France by default, because they could not go to Germany, the main destination at the time for the vast majority of Turkish migrant workers.

The first bilateral immigration agreement between France and Turkey was signed in 1965, but massive Turkish migration only started at the beginning of the 1970s and continued in the 1980s. In 1968, 7,628 Turks lived in France. Between 1968 and 1972 the Turkish population increased to 50,860; and between 1972 and 1982, it rose further to 123,540. The increase is not only due to labour migration but also to family reunification for those immigrants whose families had remained in the home country. In the 1982 census, the consequences of family reunification were already apparent. It revealed a sharp rise in the number of both women and young people. By 1990, there were 202,000 Turks in France. They were then the fourth largest immigrant community in the country. Many Turkish families have now settled in France. According to the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE), the Turkish population in France is estimated to be 400,000, of whom around 90% are less than 55 years old and 40% are less than 25 years old. Women represent nearly half of the population (46%). Around 15,000 Turks have acquired French citizenship (the number is very low due to French language proficiency requirements for applicants).

The majority of Turkish immigrants in France are blue-collar workers. According to Echardour & Maurin (1993), 43.7% of Turks are working in production, 28.5% in the construction, and 23.5% in the services industries. Although according to Brabant (1992) there has been a slight shift in the occupational structure from blue-collar (89.9% in 1982, 80% in 1989) to white-collar jobs and self-employment (both, 6.6% in 1982, 18.5% in 1989),

the majority of the working Turkish population can still be identified as blue-collar.

Today, the largest proportion of the Turkish population can be found in the region of the Île de France -27% of all the Turks live in this region, Manço (2004). The second region is Rhône-Alpes (17%) with 38.185 individuals. Alsace comes next with 15%, Villanova (1997).

In France, in-group marriage tendencies are very strong. According to INSEE, 98% of the girls and 92% of the boys marry with a person from Turkey, which is why the migration process renews itself continuously. Young immigrants born in Turkey and arriving in France through family reunification contribute to language maintenance. The population numbers of Turkish immigrants in France is very young, which is the same pattern observed in other Turkish immigration contexts as well. According to the Turkish Embassy in Paris, Turkish origin pupils from nursery school up to university are estimated to be 71,321 in France. While the level of education is rising with the second generation, which could be considered as perfectly French-speaking, among the first generation, about 100% of the women and 75 % of men hardly speak any French or do not speak any French at all. According to INSEE, among Turkish families, 17% of the fathers and 3% of the mothers talk to their children in French (as compared to 69% and 52% of the fathers and mothers among families of Algerian background).

As it is the case of other Turkish migration contexts in Europe, Turks in France are able to visit their homeland at least once every year. Turkish language media are readily accessible to Turkish immigrants in France. More than 97% of families are equipped with satellite dishes which allow them to watch Turkish television and ensure daily contact with Turkey and the Turkish language. Besides, in the age of the internet, Turks are able to access a rich variety of first language medium resources in cyberspace. As a result, the use of Turkish remains very active in many families. Moreover, Turkish mothers, whose

French competence is often very limited, further guarantee language transmission and maintenance. These support factors, presumably, contribute to the maintenance of Turkish language and culture, and also provide a wide (and rich) social network for Turkish immigrants.

Methodology

The groups of bilingual and monolingual subjects were organized according to their school-grade level. In order to control for gender factor, we included equal numbers of males and females for each group of population. That's why, at least 10 female and 10 male children and young people from each group participated in the study. Table 1 gives the number of informants and mean ages for each population per school grade level. We can see that mean age per group is very close as the informants were at the same school-grade level.

Population	Turkish-French Bilinguals		French Monolinguals		Turkish Monolinguals		Total
	Number	Mean age	Number	Mean age	Number	Mean age	
Primary	29	11;00	20	11;01	23	11;00	72
Secondary	27	13;01	22	13;04	22	12;09	71
High school	29	16;01	21	16;03	20	15;06	70
University	29	21;08	20	21;06	23	22;04	64
Total	106		86		85		277

Table 1: Total number of informants per group and school-grade level

Our bilingual informants are sons and daughters of the first generation immigrants in France and all of them were born there. They acquire Turkish exclusively within the family up to the age of 7. From that age on, some children have the possibility of attending Home Language Instruction classes (henceforth HLI) until the end of secondary school. In HLI classes the children are given the opportunity to learn to read and write in Turkish. All of our participants attended HLI classes from the age of 7 onwards. They started to acquire

French, (which became their dominant language), essentially at nursery school which they entered at the age of 3, Akinci (1996).

In order to compare and contrast the literacy activities of bilingual children with monolingual Turkish and monolingual French young people respectively, we also collected cross-sectional data in Turkey and France. Through comparing bilinguals to monolinguals, our aim was to investigate how monolingual and bilingual students of different ages engage in literacy practices similarly or differently. As Delamotte-Legrand (to appear) argues, “the comparative method is widely used in sociolinguistics as differential approach to characterize language uses of various social groups”.

Our French monolingual informants were raised and educated in French. They attended the same schools and most of them lived in the same surrounding neighbourhoods as the bilingual immigrant children. Many of them had been at school together since nursery school. Data from Turkish monolinguals were collected in a little town of Turkey that matched the place of origin of the parents of the bilingual informants. Two schools in a district of Denizli cooperated in this study. These monolingual groups are comparable with our bilingual group in terms of socioeconomic status.

The fathers of the Turkish bilingual young people were mainly factory employees or unskilled workers and free-lance masons. These two occupations constituted more than half of the fathers' occupations (56 out of 106). They were widely under-represented in more skilled jobs (such as technician, trader or office workers). The French monolinguals' fathers usually held more skilled or professional jobs. As for the Turkish monolinguals' fathers, they often held jobs as farmers, craftsmen and storekeepers, teachers, and some of them were retired. As far as the mothers' occupation is concerned, we observed that the mothers of bilinguals and Turkish monolinguals were more often housewives than those of the

French monolinguals. This situation concerns indeed respectively 72% and 73% of bilingual and Turkish monolinguals' mothers. In contrast, the French monolinguals' mothers were represented in almost all occupations. They worked more often as managers, office managers or as cleaning ladies.

All subjects in France and Turkey were given similar motivational instructions. They were asked to produce two types of text (personal narration and expository) in two modalities (spoken and written), amounting to two narrative and two expository texts per speaker. All subjects produced both the narrative and expository texts in two modalities of speech and writing yielding a total of 4 texts per subject. The mode of presentation was balanced across the tasks, so that half of the subjects performed the spoken task first, and then produced a written text, while the other half started with the written text and continued with the spoken task. Before the data collection phase began, the background information of our subjects was collected with a kind of survey questionnaire filled out by the child. In this paper, we discuss some emerging results from this questionnaire.

The survey questionnaire included 25 items for bilingual and 21 for monolingual informants. It included three sections on:

- background characteristics (demographic information),
- language use and language choice across participants (e.g. parents, friends) and contexts (i.e. in France and in Turkey, the latter set of questions only for bilinguals) and
- literacy-related activities (e.g. reading newspapers, magazines, books, writing letters, keeping diaries, watching TV, listening to the radio, using a computer etc.).

For each item, we asked the frequency of practices, across three choices – often, sometimes and never –, but also asked about

which languages they used (Turkish, French, mix or other languages). The data set was subjected to a number of statistical analyses: the values of these tests were accepted as significant for $p < .05$.

Emerging results

According to Dabène & Moore (1995, 24)

because of its strong emblematic power, language choice defines adherence to group values and sets the limits between those who can speak the language and those who cannot.

Besides, in her study that investigates the language of interaction of two bilingual sisters, Martinez-Lage (2007) showed that for bilingual individuals who live in monolingual environments, it may not be just the environment that determines their choice of language of interaction, but rather other factors must be considered as well, such as age, communicative needs, and linguistic functions. That's why, we began our study by analysing bilingual subjects' language choices. Our data allowed us to compare language use with different interlocutors and in various situations:

1. when the bilingual informants are addressing their mother, father, siblings, friends and grandparents of the same origin,
2. when these interlocutors are addressing our bilingual informants and
3. when these interactions take place in France or in Turkey. Then, we compared our findings across our four age groups.

Concerning interactions, we looked at their consensual (reciprocal) or conflicting (non-reciprocal) character, Gonac'h

(2008, 179), Dabène & Moore (1995). By consensual interactions, we understand interactions in which the same language or languages is/are used by both interlocutors. On the other hand, by conflicting interactions, we understand interactions where the child does not address his interlocutor in the same language as his interlocutor, or the reverse.

Language use in France

Table 2 presents results on language use by bilingual informants with different interlocutors in France. Table 3 presents language use by the same interlocutors with the bilingual informants also in France.

Interlocutors	French only	Turkish only	Both FR - TR	Non-response
Mother	3	62	35	
Father		55.5	43.5	1
Brothers/sisters	40.5	1	55.5	3
Friends of same origins	37.5	2	61.5	
Grand-parents		79	2	19

Table 2: Language used by bilingual informants with different interlocutors in France (in %).

Interlocutors	French only	Turkish only	Both FR - TR	Non-response
Mother	2	76.5	21.5	
Father	1	66	33	
Brothers/sisters	40.5		57.5	2
Friends of same origins	38.5	2	57.5	2
Grand-parents	1	77.5	1	20.5

Table 3: Language used by interlocutors with bilingual informants in France (in %).

These tables show clear differences between subjects' language use patterns according to interlocutor. As Table 2 indicates, bilingual informants speak mostly only Turkish with their parents. They are very few who interact only in French. Moreover, bilingual informants engage in consensual interactions with fathers, with whom both languages (French

and Turkish) are more often used than with mothers (31% of subject alternate languages with fathers against 20% with mothers).

We also observed low conflicting interactions between informants and their parents (18% with mothers, 14% with fathers). When these interactions take place, it is usually that the child alternates between French and Turkish when speaking with his mother or father, and when his/her parents answers back to him/her, it is usually in Turkish (74% conflicting interactions with mothers, 86% conflicting interactions with fathers). Unfortunately, we did not collect information about the date of arrival of parents in France so we were not able to factor this in our analysis. We expect that if the parent arrived in France through marriage, the child will use only Turkish with him/her where as if the parent grew up in France, French will be more dominant. As mentioned above, marriage with someone from Turkey was very frequent in France.

As for interactions with brothers, sisters and friends, informants use either mainly French-Turkish alternation, or French only: 49% of the interactions with brothers and sisters are consensual in French-Turkish alternation and 39% of them are consensual in French. With friends, 51% of interactions are consensual in French-Turkish alternation and 28% in French. In the case of grand-parents who lived in France - the high number of non-responses corresponds doubtless to situations where grand-parents lived in Turkey - interactions are in Turkish only with all of them.

To sum up, it can be concluded that bilingual informants have different language use patterns depending on generation. Therefore, we could summarize our findings as follows.

Table 4 suggests that a slow but gradual process of language shift is taking place among Turkish-French bilingual young people. These results are supported by previous research carried out in France, in which Turkish immigrant children and

adolescents reported that they almost exclusively communicated in Turkish with their parents but mostly in French with their siblings, Akinci (1996), Yağmur & Akinci (2003), Irtis-Dabbagh (2003), Mortamet (2005), Gautier-Kızılyürek (2007). However, we need to be cautious regarding our predictions about the future of Turkish language use in France: we do not seem to be witnessing an irreversible and progressive abandonment of the home language. Our findings do not seem to support the view that Turkish-French bilinguals may not speak Turkish any more with their own children nor that they will eventually stop speaking Turkish with their peers. Indeed, only a study looking at our informants' actual language use would shed more light onto these processes of gradual language shift that are informants reported. Moreover, as our previous research seems to suggest, compared to the pessimistic first generation Turkish parents who believe that Turkish will be lost among second and third generations overall second generation Turks in France think that Turkish will be very strong in the future. Nevertheless, the view that the position of the Turkish language would be stronger was not shared by all the informants, Yağmur & Akinci (2003).

Interlocutors	Generation	Language spoken
Grandparents	Generation -2	Turkish only
Parents	Generation -1	1. Turkish only; 2. French and Turkish
Brothers, sisters and friends	Generation 0	1. French and Turkish 2. French only

Table 4: Language use patterns across different immigrant generations in France.

Language use in Turkey

Similar general tendencies in language use are observed when interactions take place in Turkey, apart from the fact that, as we would expect, use of Turkish only or with French, depending on interlocutor, is more frequent in Turkey than in France. Interactions with parents are mainly consensual in Turkish only (79% of interactions with mother and 74% with father). Thus,

alternation appears much more marginal than in France (10% of interactions mother and 11% of interactions with father respectively are consensual).

Interlocutors	French only	Turkish only	Both FR -TR	Non-response
Mother		81	18	1
Father		79	20	1
Brothers/sisters	19	20.5	56.5	4
Friends of same origins	4.5	72.5	19	4
Grand-parents	1	89.5	1	8.5

Table 5: Language use by bilingual informants with different interlocutors in Turkey (in %).

Interlocutors	French only	Turkish only	Both FR -TR	Non-response
Mother		86	12	2
Father		82	16	2
Brothers/sisters	22	16	56.5	5.5
Friends of same origins	13.5	62	19	5.5
Grand-parents		90.5	1	8.5

Table 6: Language use by interlocutors with bilingual informants in Turkey (in %).

For a minority of bilingual informants, which are in conflicting interactions with their parents in Turkey, Turkish coexists with Turkish-French alternation. In that case, Turkish-French alternation is more often initiated by the child than the parent. As concerns interactions with siblings and friends, it appears that in Turkey interactions take place in Turkish only (14% of interactions are consensual) while we never observe similar interactions in Turkish in France. Interactions in French only are less frequent too (only 16% of informants engage in consensual interactions with brothers and sisters in Turkey as opposed to 34% in France). However, use of language alternation remains the same (49% of subjects use it in consensual ways).

Interactions with friends in Turkey take place much more often in Turkish than in French only (60% of subjects speak Turkish in consensual interactions with their friends in Turkey as

opposed to only one case observed in France -less than 1%). Using only French, in consensual or conflicting interactions, is rare. Interactions with grand-parents in Turkey are not changing similar to the case in France. It appears that for the bilingual young people grand-parents whether living in France or in Turkey are seen as belonging to the country of origin and to the culture of origin and are always addressed in Turkish.

Language use and age

We wanted to know whether according to their age, bilinguals used Turkish differently in their interactions with family and peers. Our findings show that the age factor may explain some differences in their language use practices. Overall, we found that there are no differences across age groups in language choice with interlocutors in France regardless of the direction of the interaction. As regards language choice in Turkey, only interactions with friends of same origin are changing with age: younger (primary and secondary school) pupils use more only Turkish than older ones who use more often Turkish-French alternation (high school and university students) and French (university students). Differences are significant for both types of interactions: informant-initiated interactions with his friends ($p=0,03$) and friend-initiated interactions with informant ($p=0,04$). We can conclude that when high school and university students return to Turkey, they are more in touch with peers speaking French than younger informants are. Finally, it should be added that there is no significant relationship between frequency of returning to Turkey and age: all bilingual informants report returning to Turkey with the same frequency (38.5% every year, 56.5% every 2-3 years, 4% for 4-5 years).

Biliteracy activities of bilinguals and monolinguals

Reading activities

We first explored the frequency of reading the press. There appear to be two significant differences: first, between primary

school age children ($p=0,0001$), and second, secondary school students ($p=0,002$). Within these two age groups, bilinguals read the press less than both of the monolingual groups. Monolingual French and Turkish do not show any differences between them. As for frequency of reading the press in the dominant language of the country of residence (in French for French monolinguals and for bilinguals, in Turkish for Turkish monolinguals), only one result is significant: Turkish monolingual students report reading the press in the dominant language of their country of residence (i.e. Turkish) significantly more often than the two other groups of students. There is no difference in reading the press in foreign languages across age groups and pupil populations. Students read of course more the press in a foreign language than primary, secondary and high school students, but they do not distinguish themselves according to their group of membership (i.e. Turkish-French bilinguals, Turkish monolinguals and French monolinguals).

As for reading books, no significant difference is observed across the three different pupil populations. All informants read books at the same rate. Concerning reading books in the dominant language, the significant difference concerned bilingual students who read less often books in French (they answered proportionately more often ‘sometimes’) than French and Turkish monolinguals in their respective languages. Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out that there is a significant link between reading books in French and types of studies that students are doing ($p=0,0008$): as bilinguals are mainly in the Sciences, Engineering and Economics, they read less often books in French than French monolinguals who are in Languages or in the Social sciences. It appears also that French monolingual students report reading more often than monolingual Turkish students.

When we observe the frequency of reading books in foreign languages, Turkish monolingual secondary school students read books more and more often in foreign languages than French monolingual and Turkish-French bilingual secondary school

students do in France. These last two pupil populations in France do not show any differences. This difference may reflect the fact that the school curriculum in Turkey consists of more lessons in foreign languages than the French one.

Comparing types of books read, it appears that secondary school Turkish monolinguals do not read comics. For students, we find the same findings: Turkish monolingual students declare not reading comics. We also observe that French monolingual students read more comics than bilinguals. This difference may be related to specific cultural practices in each country since in Turkey reading comics is not a very common literacy activity. Finally, secondary school monolingual Turkish students read more fantasy novels than French monolinguals do.

Writing activities

When comparing numbers of informants reporting their out of school writing activities, Turkish-French bilingual primary school children distinguished themselves significantly from others reporting much more often that they never write. As for frequency of writing in the dominant language, there are four significant results which concern primary and secondary school pupils. Thus, bilingual primary school children are distinguished by the fact that they claim to write less frequently than French monolinguals. Both populations distinguish themselves from Turkish monolinguals who are in an intermediate position. Also, bilingual secondary school students report writing less frequently than both monolingual populations. Finally, Turkish monolinguals report engaging in out of school writing activities significantly more often than French monolinguals. Concerning writing in a foreign language, we observe no differences between populations. The majority of pupils and students do engage in writing activities in a foreign language.

As far as types of writing, primary and secondary school children engage in specific writing types as shown in the table below:

School level	Turkish-French Bilinguals	French monolinguals	Turkish monolinguals
Primary	+ letters	+ songs	+ stories
	– diaries	+ diaries	– lists
	– narratives		– jokes
Secondary			– songs
	+ lists	+ letters	+ poems
	– stories	+ stories	– letters
		+ songs	– lists

Table 7: Writing types according to population and age groups

This table shows some cultural characteristics. Turkish monolingual young children engage in “less playful” writing activities than the other young children. They write more stories and poems. Bilinguals practice fewer so-called “privileged” types of writing (they report writing letters and lists only) and French monolinguals report engaging in more varied writing activities. High school and university students do not distinguish themselves on this parameter according to their origin. In France it is very common for young people and teenagers to keep diaries, although this writing practice is gradually being adopted in Turkey too.

Watching TV and listening to the radio

All French monolinguals, whatever their ages are (primary, secondary school children, high school or university students), report watching more TV in the dominant language than bilinguals and Turkish monolinguals. These last two populations do not show any differences in their TV viewing practices. However, as mentioned by Lytra in her study on a Turkish-speaking community in Greece (2006, 243), Turkish bilinguals in France also watch Turkish satellite TV and DVDs and listen to CDs featuring the latest music hits from Turkey. Our study confirms other studies which showed that Turkish-French bilinguals predominantly prefer watching TV in Turkish than in French, Irtis-Dabbagh (2003), Mortamet (2005). As concerns listening to the radio, there are no significant differences.

Secondary school French monolinguals report listening to the radio more often than bilinguals. Although all Turks of France can easily watch all Turkish TV channels via satellite, there are not any Turkish radio stations in the cities our bilingual informants lived in. The only possibility of listening to the radio in the mother tongue is via the Internet or satellite.

Conclusion

First of all, our study shows that Turkish-French bilingual young people who are the product of Turkish immigration have very similar literacy-related activities with those of French and Turkish monolinguals. Even if bilinguals differ from monolinguals in some activities (i.e. bilingual children rarely report engaging in out of school writing activities, and reading the press), it emerges that there are no significant differences between bilingual and monolingual informants, especially when it comes to reading books, watching TV, listening to the radio, etc. We believe that these similarities and differences may reflect similarities and differences in our informants' social class, age, peer group affiliations and media consumption.

Our results also suggest that Turkish-French bilinguals still maintain strong links with their language and culture of origin: they frequently return in their country of origin, they watch more Turkish television and they often use their mother tongue with their parents. In that way, our study confirms several previous studies, Akinci (1996), Yağmur & Akinci (2003), Irtis-Dabbagh, (2003). For instance, in a similar comparative study Mortamet (2005) looked at the literacy activities of students from four different ethnic origins in France: Africans, Maghrebis, Turkish and French. Compared to Africans and Maghrebis, Turkish students, she found, maintain a much stronger relationship with their origins through language maintenance practices in Turkish. Another significant observation by Mortamet (2005) which is relevant in our study too concerns the different investment in technology among the four ethnic groups she studied: all Turkish students have a

computer, and even more often than French students whose parents have a higher socioeconomic status. We can, therefore, argue that young second generation Turkish-French bilingual children and adolescents are in the process of preserving their language and culture of origin and are, at the same time, integrating in the dominant culture of the country they live, albeit more slowly than other young immigrant people. As Dabène & Moore (1995, 24) point out:

Young adolescents in post-migratory situations, who have been socialised in rival cultural and linguistic systems, often feel part of both home and host cultures, and demonstrate convergence through language choice to one or the other according to the situation.

In his study of cultural activities of 15-24 year olds in France, Patureau (1992) concludes that young people place their life of leisure activities under the signs of exit and movement, strong intra-generational sociability, entertainment and free individual expression. For this age group, he identifies some common characteristics, such as engagement in particular music practices and amateur activities, increase of TV and video viewing, decrease in book reading and the favouring of magazines over newspapers. We observed that similar literacy activities were relevant for our informants as young people as well. Our findings have important implications about how young immigrant people are viewed. As claims Irtis-Dabbagh (2003, 277),

we refuse to ignore young people's potential, often described as sitting between two chairs, or as part of suspended culture. Socialization in a multi-cultural space takes part not only of an inheritance of the past but also of the current work.

That's why we think that second generation bilinguals possess not only specific literacy activities that are different from monolinguals but also similar ones, perhaps reflecting the

multiple and shifting affiliations and identifications. Further investigation is needed to explore our bilingual informants' actual literacy-related activities in their everyday life by examining their text productions, for instance, their use of new technologies (email, SMS, internet forums and blogs).

References

- Akinci, Mehmet-Ali (1996): Les Pratiques Langagières chez les Immigrés Turcs en France. *Écarts d'Identité* n°76, 14-17. Grenoble: Adate.
- Akinci, Mehmet-Ali (2003): Une Situation de Contact de Langues: Le Cas Turc-français des Immigrés Turcs en France. In: Jacqueline Billiez (ed): *Contacts de Langues: Modèles, Typologies, Interventions*, 127-144. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Akinci, Mehmet-Ali (2006): Du Bilinguisme à la Bilittéracie. Comparaison entre Élèves Bilingues Turc-français et Élèves Monolingues Français. *Langage et Société* n°116, 93-110. Paris: Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'homme.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis (2007): Bilingualism in the Mass Media and on the Internet. In: Monica Heller (ed.): *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. 207-230. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baker, Colin (2001): *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Brabant, Jacques (1992): Une Insertion Économique Problématique. *Hommes et Migrations* n°1153, 34-38.
- Cummins, Jim (1979): Linguistic Interdependence and the Educational Development of Bilingual Children. *Review of Educational Research* n°49(2), 222-251.
- Cummins, Jim (1991): Interdependence of First and Second Language Proficiency in Bilingual Children. In: Ellen Bialystok (ed.): *Language Processing in Bilingual Children*. 70-89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Dabène, Louise & Danièle Moore (1995): *Bilingual Speech of Migrant People*. In: Lesley Milroy & Peter Muysken (eds): *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, 17-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Datta, Manjula (2000): *Bilinguality and Literacy: Principles and Practice*. London: Continuum.
- Delamotte-Legrand, Régine (to appear): *Comparer les Usages du Français de Jeunes Bilingues et Monolingues: Une Approche Différentialiste*. *Educazione e Societa Plurilingue*, Aosta: CMIEBP.
- Deprez, Christine (1994): *Les Enfants Bilingues: Langues et Familles*. Paris: CREDIF Essais - Didier.
- Durgunoğlu, Aydın Y. & Ludo Verhoeven (1998): *Literacy Development in a Multilingual Context*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Echardour, Annick & Eric Maurin (1993): *La Main d'Œuvre Étrangère*. In: INSEE (éd.): *Données Sociales*. 504-513. Paris: INSEE.
- Extra, Guus & Kutlay Yağmur (2004): *Urban Multilingualism in Europe: Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hamers, Josiane F. & Michel Blanc (1983): *Bilinguisme et Bilingualité*. Bruxelles: Pierre Mardaga.
- Giles Howard, Richard Y. Bourhis & Donald M. Taylor (1977): *Towards a Theory of Language in Ethnic group Relations*. In: Howard Giles (ed.): *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. 307-348. London: Academic Press.
- Gonac'h, Jeanne (2008): *Bilinguisme et Bilittéracie chez des Jeunes de la Deuxième Génération de Migrants. Le Cas de Lycéens et d'Étudiants d'Origine Turque en France et en Angleterre*. Unpublished PhD. Université de Rouen.
- Gautier-Kizilyürek, Sylvaine (2007): *Les Enseignements de Langue et Culture d'Origine en France: Chronique d'une Mort Annoncée? Le Cas de la Langue Turque*. In: Fabienne Baider (ed): *Emprunts Linguistiques, Empreintes Culturelles*, 141-158. Paris: L'Harmattan.

- Gonzo, Susan & Mario Saltarelli (1983): *Pidginization and Linguistic Change in Emigrant Languages*. In: Roger W. Andersen (ed.): *Pidginization and Creolization as Language Acquisition*, 181-197. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Haugen, Einar (1977): *Norm and Deviation in Bilingual Communities*. In: Peter A. Hornby (ed.): *Bilingualism: Psychological, Social and Education Implications*. 91-102. New York: Academic Press.
- Irtis-Dabbagh, Verda (2003): *Les Jeunes Issus de l'Immigration de Turquie en France: État des Lieux, Analyses et Perspectives*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Jaffré, Jean-Pierre (2004): *La Littéracie: Histoire d'un Mot, Effets d'un Concept*. In: Christine Barré-De-Miniac, Catherine Brissaud & Marielle Rispaïl (eds): *La Littéracie, Concepts Théoriques et Pratiques d'Enseignement de la Lecture Écriture*, 21-41. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Kipp, Sandra, Michael Clyne & Anne Pauwels (1995): *Immigration and Australia's Language Resources*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Leu, Donald J. Jr. (2002): *The New Literacies: Research on Reading Instruction with the Internet*. In Alan E. Farstrup, & S. Jay Samuels (eds.), *What Research has to Say about Reading Instruction*, 310-336. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Lüdi, Georges & Py Bernard (2003): *Être Bilingue*. (2nd ed.) Berne: Peter Lang.
- Lytra, Vally (2006): *Mass Media, Music making and Identities in an Athens primary school*. In: Christa Dürscheid & J. Spitzmüller (eds): *Trends and Developments in Youth Language Research*, 239-257. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Manço, Ural (2004): *Turcs d'Europe: Une Présence Diasporique Unique par son Poids Démographique et sa Complexité Sociale*. In: Altay Manço (ed.): *Turquie: Vers de Nouveaux Horizons Migratoires?*, 153-177. Paris: L'Harmattan.

- Martinez-Lage, Ana (2007): Language of Interaction between Bilingual Siblings. Paper presented at the 6th International Symposium on Bilingualism. University of Hamburg.
- Mortamet, Clara (2005): Usages des Langues au Quotidien: Le Cas des Immigrations Maghrébines, Africaines et Turques dans l'Agglomération Rouennaise. *Glottopol*, n°5, 44-66. www.univ-rouen.fr/dyalang/. Rouen: Dyalang.
- Patureau, Frédérique (1992): *Les Pratiques Culturelles des Jeunes*. Paris: La Documentation Française.
- Rampton, Ben (1995): *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescence*. London/New York: Longman.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & P. Toukomaa (1976) *Teaching Migrant Children's Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in the Context of the Socio-cultural Situation of the Migrant Family*, Tampere: Tukimuksia Research Reports.
- Street, Brian (1993) *Cross-cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman (1988): *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Verhoeven, Ludo (1994): *Functional literacy: Theoretical Issues and Educational Implications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Villanova de, Roselyne (1997): Turkish Housing Conditions in France: From Tenant to Owner. In: Şule Özüekren & Ronald Van Kempen (eds): *Turks in European Cities: Housing and Urban Segregation. Comparative Studies in Migration and Ethnic Relations* n°4, 98-121. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Yağmur, Kutlay & Akinci, Mehmet-Ali (2003): Language Use, Choice, Maintenance and Ethnolinguistic Vitality of Turkish speakers in France: Intergenerational differences. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, n°164, 107-128. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.