INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF LANGUAGE

General Editor
JOSHUA A. FISHMAN

Offprint

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Language use, choice, maintenance, and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish speakers in France: intergenerational differences

KUTLAY YAGMUR and MEHMET-ALI AKINCI

Abstract

This paper presents the findings of research investigating first language maintenance and shift of Turkish speakers in France and the role of subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions in that process. It examines the relationship between societal factors and individuals' perception of the language contact situation as reflected in their speech behavior. The theoretical framework of the study is based on Giles et al.'s (1977) ethnolinguistic vitality theory. In line with the model, a subjective ethnolinguistic vitality questionnaire, a language use-choice questionnaire, and a self-rating scale have been applied to 111 second-generation and 64 first-generation informants. The findings indicate intergenerational differences among Turkish immigrants with respect to ethnolinguistic vitality of the in- and out-groups, Turkish and French language use. Second-generation informants have more positive attitudes towards Turkish and also have higher vitality ratings for the in-group than the first-generation immigrants.

Introduction

This paper examines intergenerational language maintenance patterns of Turkish immigrants and their subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions in France. In order to account for the language maintenance or shift observed in ethnic minority groups, various models have been proposed in the sociolinguistic literature. Initially language maintenance and shift were seen as two sides of the same coin, but Fishman (1965) suggested that they should be separate fields of inquiry. There is still no consensus over the definition and operationalisation of the terms shift and maintenance (Hyltenstam and Stroud 1996). Furthermore, there are a number of models for the investigation of language maintenance and shift as documented by Clyne (1991). Those developed by Kloss (1966), Giles et al.

0165–2516/03/0164–0107

(1977), Smolicz (1981), and Bourdieu (1982) identify different factors that are important in language maintenance (or shift). The factors involved are generally divided into two categories: those affecting a speech community and those affecting individuals within a speech community (Kipp et al. 1995). Group factors include size and distribution of an ethnic group, the policy of the host community towards minority languages, the position of the language within the cultural value system of the group, and proximity or distance of the minority language to or from majority language while birthplace, age, period of residence, gender, education/qualifications, marriage patterns, prior knowledge of majority language, reason for migration, and language variety are considered to be individual factors (Kipp et al. 1995: 123). 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 most cases, these factors are interrelated both on the individual and on the group level. In language contact situations one's native language is not a fixed and stable system but rather a changeable one. Even a 'prestigious' language like English is reported to be lost in a second language environment (Major 1992).

The role of ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions in language maintenance

Language maintenance is said to be influenced by the ethnolinguistic vitality (EV) of a linguistic minority group. According to Giles et al. (1977), status, demographic, institutional support and control factors combine to make up the vitality of ethnolinguistic groups. An assessment of a group's strengths and weaknesses in each of these domains provides a rough classification of ethnolinguistic groups into those having *low, medium,* or *high* vitality. Low vitality groups are most likely to go through linguistic assimilation and may not be considered a distinctive collective group (Bourhis et al. 1981). On the other hand, high vitality groups are likely to maintain their language and distinctive cultural traits in multilingual settings. In Giles et al.'s framework (1977), status variables involve the economic, social, sociohistorical, and language status of the group within or outside the mainstream community. Demographic variables are those related to the number and distributional patterns of ethnolinguistic group members throughout a particular region or national territory. Demographic variables also include the birth rate, the group's rate of mixed marriages, and the rate of immigration and emigration patterns. Institutional support and control factors refer to the extent to which an ethnolinguistic group receives formal and informal support in various institutions, in particular mass media, education, government services, industry, religion, culture,

and politics. The key prediction of EV theory is that mother tongues of communities with high ethnolinguistic vitality will be retained, while those with low EV will tend to be replaced by the dominant language.

In the last decade, empirical work has begun to test the usefulness of the concept of ethnolinguistic vitality as a research tool (Bourhis and Sachdev 1984; Giles et al. 1985; Pittam et al. 1991; Willemyns et al. 1993; Yagmur et al. 1999). The findings of these studies claimed 'strong empirical support' for the social psychological nature of the concepts of both objective and perceived ethnolinguistic vitality, but there is also considerable discussion of various aspects of the theory and its application in empirical research. EV theory (EVT) was criticized by some researchers with respect to its specification and application (Haarmann 1986; Husband and Saifullah Khan 1982; Tollefson 1991). Husband and Saifullah Khan (1982) argued that the sociostructural variables identified as determining vitality are conceptually ambiguous. They added that by simply depending on sociological and demographic information, these variables might produce a simplified analysis of ethnolinguistic groups. It appears from the literature that the most controversial issue in EV studies is the operationalisation of the constructs and the obtaining of the dimensions underlying the proposed variables in Bourhis et al.'s (1981) Subjective Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire (SEVQ).

In this study, the relationship between subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions of Turkish immigrants and their language use, choice, and attitudes is investigated. In line with EVT, first an objective assessment of Turkish immigrant group in the French context is presented. Subsequently, in accordance with the above framework, findings on language maintenance, language attitudes, and ethnolinguistic vitality measures of Turkish immigrants in France will be documented.

Turkish immigrants in France

The immigration history of the Turkish community in France is the shortest compared to other immigrant communities. Shortly after World War II, only 7,770 Turks lived in France. This number declined to 5,273 in 1954 and increased slightly to 7,628 in 1968. 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. 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 labor migration but also due 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 obvious. It revealed a sharp rise in the number of both women and young people (between 10 and 34 years). By the year 1990, there were 202,000 Turks in France. They were then the fourth largest immigrant community in the country. In 1990, for half of the Turkish population, the average age was below twenty. Thus, as opposed to less-educated first generation Turkish immigrants, the young generations have been through the French school system and their educational and vocational profiles are much better than the previous generations. This modifies the general profile and outlook of the Turkish population in France. The children tend to be bilingual, speaking Turkish with the parents and French among themselves (Akinci 1996, 1999). Many Turkish families have now settled in France. They maintain contacts with the homeland. They may end up staying in France indefinitely, whereas at first they thought their stay was only temporary. Today, the Turkish population in France is estimated to be 350,000, of whom around 15,000 Turks have acquired French nationality (the number is very low due to French language proficiency condition for the applicants).

The majority of Turkish immigrants in France are blue-collar workers. According to Echardour and Maurin (1993), 43.7 percent of Turks are working in production, 28.5 percent in construction, and 23.5 percent in the services. Although, following the study of 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 Île de France (20% of all the Turks live in this region). The second region is Rhône-Alpes (17%) with 38,185 individuals. Alsace comes next with 15 percent (Villanova 1997). The informants in this study are all from Rhône-Alpes.

Like in other major immigration contexts (Australia, Germany, The Netherlands), in-group marriage tendency is very strong. According to Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques (INSEE) (1997), 98 percent of the girls and 92 percent of the boys are marrying with a person from Turkey, which is why the migration process renews itself continuously. Turkey-born young immigrants arriving in France through family reunification contribute to language maintenance. According to INSEE, in Turkish families, 17 percent of the fathers and 3 percent of the mothers talk to their children in French (as compared to 69% and 52% of the Algerians.) The population structure of Turkish immigrants in France is very young, which is the same pattern observed in other immigration contexts as well. In 1994, 50,000 Turkish children were in primary schools, 30,000 in secondary schools, and 3,000 in special classes.

Compared to the other immigration contexts (such as Australia or the United States of America), Turkish immigrants in France have more resources, domains, and facilities for first language use and maintenance. The Turkish immigrants in Europe are able to visit their homeland at least once every year, whereas, due to the geographic distance and high cost of travel, Turkish immigrants in Australia visit Turkey every four to six years (Yagmur et al. 1999). Most Turkish people bury their dead in Australia. Initially, they used to send their dead to Turkey to be buried in the homeland. This tradition of sending their dead to Turkey is still very strong among Turkish immigrants in France and in other West European countries. There are special Islamic organizations to cater for this need of the community.

Turkish language media is readily accessible to Turkish immigrants in France. Most of the major Turkish newspapers have rather high-circulation European editions. There are weekly magazines and journals coming from Turkey as well. Turkish bookshops provide a wide range of Turkish-medium books in major areas of Turkish concentration. On a regular basis, Turkish language plays are performed by actors from Turkish state theaters and private theaters, as well as by local immigrant Turkish theater groups. Movies, concerts, and exhibitions by Turkish artists are also very common all over Western Europe. In the main Turkish-concentration areas, public libraries have quite rich collections. These libraries also organize panels during which novelists from Turkey meet Turkish immigrants and interested mainstream community members. Along with print media, major Turkish TV channels can be received by cable or satellite dish. Members of the receiving societies are mostly critical of satellite dishes, arguing that they delay '*integration*' of immigrants. Some marginal groups even support the idea of a "ban" on those satellite dishes. Nevertheless, there is a growing demand for Turkish-medium broadcasting and Turkish immigrants who have satellite dishes can receive around 30 Turkish medium channels. Besides, in the age of the internet, immigrants are able to access a rich variety of first language medium resources in cyberspace. These support factors, presumably, contribute to maintenance of Turkish language and provide a wide (and rich) social network for Turkish immigrants.

Finally, learning and teaching of Turkish considerably contributes to the maintenance of first language skills among younger generations. On the basis of a bilateral cultural agreement, French and Turkish governments agreed to provide mother tongue education for Turkish children in French schools. In line with the practice in many other European countries, the Turkish government sends teachers from Turkey to teach Turkish language, Turkish history, and geography in French schools.

French language policies concerning linguistic minorities

Compared to other West European countries, French policies concerning ethnic minorities are considerably different in many respects. However, like many other West European countries, nation-state ideology and maintenance of nationhood rooted in a commonly shared notion of cultural unity underlies French language policies (Archibald 2002). Rather than promoting linguistic and cultural pluralism, French policies explicitly opted for integration and linguistic assimilation of immigrants. For this purpose, to transform immigrants into French nationals, a commission on nationality was set up in 1987. The commission took a number of measures to set up the legal framework for achieving the assimilation of immigrants into the mainstream society (Lapeyronne 1990, cited in Archibald 2002). Along with many other factors, mastery of French was seen to be the most fundamental aspect of the acculturation process because language is considered to be the overarching value to achieve social cohesion and national unity in France. Given the circumstances, one would hardly expect first language maintenance among younger immigrants. However, the linguistic and cultural assimilation of Turkish immigrants is shown to be very low in France (Tribalat 1998).

Methodology

Given the sociolinguistic situation described above, the main aim of this study is to see the effect of subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions on language maintenance, use, and choice of Turkish immigrants in France. In the literature on EVT, few empirical attempts have been made to test how subjective vitality perceptions could predict the language behavior of ethnolinguistic groups (Allard and Landry 1986; Bourhis and Sachdev 1984; Yagmur 1997). Most of these studies were conducted in the Australian, Canadian, and British contexts. However, in the European context, there are not many comprehensive studies investigating the relationship between the ethnolinguistic vitality of an ethnic group and the extent of the group's first language maintenance or shift, which necessitates more empirical evidence. By conducting this study, the effects of subjective vitality perceptions on language behavior of Turkish immigrants in France will be tested. Apart from the SEVQ, by means of a sociolinguistic questionnaire, self-reports of French and Turkish language skills, language choice, preference, and attitudes of Turkish speakers will be documented. As indicated in the literature, depending on the generation of speakers, language use, choice, and proficiency patterns differ. On the basis of the data collected, we wanted to test the following hypotheses:

1. Older immigrants have more positive attitudes towards Turkish language than younger immigrants (France-born second generation);
2. Accordingly, concerning Turkish vitality, older immigrants have higher subjective vitality perceptions than younger immigrants;
3. There is a relationship between first language use and ethnolinguistic vitality of the Turkish immigrants.

In order to test these hypotheses, two groups of informants were included in this study so that intergenerational differences could be accounted for. In testing the third hypothesis, language use and proficiency of first and second-generation informants will be correlated to subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions so that the level of interaction between these dimensions can be seen.

Informants

The majority of Turkish immigrants are blue-collar and they are mostly concentrated in the industrial area of the Rhône-Alpes region. Consequently, the informants for this study were selected from the Turkish immigrant community living in Lyon and Grenoble. In order to see intergenerational differences, informants from different age groups were selected. There are 175 informants, 80 of whom are females and 95 of them are males. The informants are divided into two groups, mainly on the basis of their age. Birth country criteria was also considered in this categorization but some Turkey-born young informants are included in the category of second-generation as they came to France at a very young age. Table 1 gives the details of informants.

Data collection instruments

Three types of questionnaires were used as data collection instruments: the Language Use-Choice Questionnaire (LUCQ), the Subjective Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire (SEVQ), and Self-rating Scales (SRS). The LUCQ was developed as a survey instrument. Questionnaire guidelines by

Table 1. *Informants of the study*

Groups	Country of Birth		Gender		N	Mean Age
	France	Turkey	Female	Male		
Group 1 (G1) ages 16–24	75	36	64	47	111	19.76
Group 2 (G2) ages 25+	–	64	16	48	64	37.85
Total	75	100	80	95	175	26.38

Oppenheim (1992) were followed in the design of the instrument. The questionnaire was used in different immigration contexts with Turkish immigrants (see Yagmur et al. 1999). The survey questionnaire included three sections on: background characteristics (demographic information), language use-choice, and language attitudes.

The Subjective Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire (SEVQ) involved rating French and Turkish immigrants to France on 22 items, measuring group vitality along the three dimensions of status, demography, and institutional support dimensions. The original version of SEVQ as developed by Bourhis et al. (1981) was translated into Turkish and used in this study (for details of SEVQ, see Bourhis et al. 1981). SEVQ was also used in a number of immigration contexts with Turkish immigrants (see Yagmur 1997).

The Clark (1981) self-rating scale (SRS) is a self-rating list on foreign language proficiency, but, in this study, informants rated their French and Turkish language skills. In the present form of the task, informants are asked to rate their spoken language ability on fourteen language tasks on a scale of 1 (cannot do it) to 5 (can easily do it). Language tasks range from simple to more complex tasks. Clark's self-rating scale for speaking ability was adapted for use with Turkish informants. A new self-rating scale was developed for listening comprehension in Turkish. This scale contained six tasks ranging from simple to complex activities.

Results

The information obtained from the three questionnaires constituted a large database. In order to test the hypotheses, a number of statistical procedures were followed. Before going into those procedures, a global description of results on the basis of descriptive statistics will be made in this section. In doing that, first, overall findings on LUCQ, SRS, and SEVQ will be documented. Consequently, on the basis of more advanced statistical procedures, the hypotheses will be tested.

Findings on the Language Use and Choice Questionnaire (LUCQ)

A full discussion of all the items in the LUCQ is beyond the scope of this paper. There were four subsections in LUCQ on background characteristics (21 variables), language use (10 variables), preference (10 variables), attitudes (17 variables), and choice (7 variables). After presenting the

descriptive statistics in the next section, total scores for each of the language use, choice, and attitudes as well as for self-rating will be calculated. On the basis of this data reduction, calculation of intergenerational differences and correlation of different dimensions will be easier. Table 2 documents the findings on French and Turkish use of younger and older informants.

The results show that both groups (G1, 16–24 year-olds, and G2, 25+ year-olds) maintain close contacts with Turkey. The younger group (G1) use considerably less Turkish compared to older immigrants (G2). Accordingly, the first group's Turkish reading and writing skills are lower compared to the older group. On the other hand, French language use is much more common among the younger group.

As seen in Table 2, compared to older informants, younger informants have the feeling that they experienced considerable Turkish language loss,

Table 2. *Intergenerational differences on patterns of first and second language use (N = 175).* The scale is 1 (very little) to 5 (very much)

Variables in the LUCQ	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.
Contact with the homeland	G1	111	3.24	1.32
	G2	64	3.53	1.11
Amount of Turkish use in France	G1	111	3.63	1.10
	G2	64	4.65	.69
Difficulty in speaking Turkish in Turkey	G1	111	2.33	1.18
	G2	64	1.26	.69
Difficulty in understanding Turkish in Turkey	G1	111	1.96	1.16
	G2	64	1.14	.55
Amount of French-Turkish language mixing	G1	109	2.48	1.16
	G2	63	2.07	1.14
Feeling of loss in Turkish mental lexicon	G1	109	2.72	1.18
	G2	63	1.76	1.18
Amount of reading in Turkish	G1	111	2.30	1.15
	G2	64	2.35	1.14
Amount of reading in French	G1	111	3.39	1.17
	G2	62	1.90	1.36
Difficulty experienced in reading Turkish	G1	110	2.42	1.14
	G2	63	1.74	1.09
Amount of writing in Turkish	G1	111	2.41	1.23
	G2	64	2.20	1.49
Extent of Turkish TV viewing	G1	111	4.25	1.14
	G2	63	4.11	1.30
Extent of French TV viewing	G1	109	3.70	1.26
	G2	64	2.67	1.32
Participation in Turkish community	G1	107	2.24	1.37
	G2	64	3.12	1.59
Participation in French clubs	G1	106	1.52	1.05
	G2	63	1.19	.56

which might be due to incomplete first language acquisition. In the same vein, they report some difficulty in understanding and speaking Turkish during their visits in Turkey. On the other hand, younger informants watch equally as much Turkish TV as the older informants, which show their sociocultural orientation. Concerning French TV viewing, younger informants have higher ratings than older informants. Table 3, on the other hand, presents findings on language use with different interlocutors. Irrespective of the age group, almost all the informants in the study report that they speak Turkish with their parents. A close examination of the percentages in Table 3 shows that there are clear differences between informants' language use patterns. Young informants speak mostly Turkish with their parents but with their brothers/sisters and friends, they speak more French. First-generation immigrants consistently speak Turkish with their children. Other than the interaction with parents, French seems to be the dominant language for young informants.

On the basis of the findings presented in Table 3, it can be suggested that slow but gradual language shift is taking place among young informants. Irrespective of generational differences, informants communicate almost exclusively in Turkish with their parents. French language use with the parents is minimal. Older informants (G2) speak with all interlocutors

Table 3. *Language register spoken with different interlocutors, intergenerational differences in percentages (%)*

Interlocutors	Groups	Only Turkish	Mostly Turkish	Tur/Fre Equal	Mostly French	Only French
Informant with mother/father	G1	82	12	5	1	0
	G2	97	1.5	0	1.5	0
Informant with siblings	G1	7	4	26	32	32
	G2	92	3	3	0	2
Informant with friends	G1	51	24	16	5	4
	G2	92	3	3	0	2
Informant with relatives	G1	14	13	23	29	21
	G2	67	13	15	3	2
Informant with neighbors	G1	67	14	14	4	1
	G2	84	9	5	0	2
Mother/father with informant	G1	89	9	2	0	0
	G2	97	1.5	1.5	0	0
Siblings with informant	G1	6	6	25	29	34
	G2	78	6	10	3	3
Relatives with informant	G1	58	22	14	2	4
	G2	89	6	3	0	2
Friends with informant	G1	14	13	22	28	23
	G2	66	13	12	6	3
Neighbors with informant	G1	66	20	10	2	2
	G2	81	12	3	2	2

only in Turkish (with mother/father 97%, with siblings 92%, with friends 92%, with relatives 67%, and with neighbors 84%). Younger informants (G1), on the other hand, speak more French with their siblings, friends, and relatives. These findings are supported by the findings of the Multilingual Cities Project in Lyon, which was carried out in the primary schools of six multicultural cities in Western Europe. Turkish immigrant children in Lyon reported that they almost exclusively communicate in Turkish with their parents but mostly in French with their siblings (Akinci et al. in press). The above pattern suggests a clear shift to French among younger generations.

Language preference distribution shows a clear compartmentalization for French and Turkish across the age groups. Older informants prefer Turkish under all circumstances, while younger informants prefer French. The findings reported in Tables 3 and 4 point to a clear inclination towards French among younger generations.

Younger speakers dominantly choose French for a variety of topics (see Table 5). Only concerning religious matters, younger informants, like the older informants choose Turkish. A similar pattern is observed in speaking about sociocultural matters.

Compared to findings on actual language use and preference, the results about the relative importance of French and Turkish in France seem

Table 4. *Language preferences of informants (N = 175).* The scale is 1 (only Turkish) to 5 (only French)

Language preferred when	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.
Tired	G1	111	3.67	1.42
	G2	63	1.95	1.23
Stressed	G1	111	3.71	1.41
	G2	63	1.90	1.30
Angry	G1	111	3.57	1.55
	G2	64	2.01	1.26
Embarrassed	G1	111	3.65	1.41
	G2	64	1.79	1.15
Arguing	G1	110	3.70	1.32
	G2	64	2.15	1.22
Counting	G1	111	3.90	1.25
	G2	63	2.06	1.22
In a hurry	G1	111	3.93	1.28
	G2	64	2.10	1.31
In danger	G1	111	3.91	1.34
	G2	64	2.15	1.39
Happy	G1	111	3.32	1.41
	G2	63	1.69	1.02
Confused	G1	111	3.65	1.32
	G2	63	2.07	1.11

Table 5. *Language choice patterns across topics.* The scale is 1 (only Turkish) to 5 (only French)

Topic	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.
Daily topics	G1	109	3.60	1.31
	G2	64	1.73	1.13
Academic topics	G1	107	3.98	1.18
	G2	62	2.00	1.45
Sexuality	G1	107	3.98	1.23
	G2	61	1.81	1.38
Sociopolitic issues	G1	107	3.29	1.48
	G2	62	1.75	1.21
Cultural issues	G1	110	2.66	1.47
	G2	63	1.55	.99
Religion	G1	111	1.77	1.24
	G2	63	1.25	.67
Educational issues	G1	111	3.14	1.33
	G2	63	1.57	.91

to diverge from the above findings. Even though the findings are based on reported data, given the large number of informants from two different generations, the results show an interesting pattern of language use, choice, and language attitudes towards Turkish and French. So far, it was shown that younger generations speak more French and there is a clear shift towards French. Given these findings, one would expect more positive attitudes towards Turkish among the older informants but as documented in Table 6, younger informants, in general, have much higher ratings for the importance of Turkish in France.

Concerning language attitudes towards Turkish, both groups of informants report that Turkish is important to be accepted in the Turkish community, for the maintenance of identity, for cultural survival, and in the family. Younger informants have higher ratings than older informants for the importance of Turkish to raise children. However, for instrumental uses such as finding a job, receiving education, and living in France, Turkish is considered to be less functional by both groups.

Self-rating scales

When the mean values in Table 7 are examined, a clear intergenerational difference with respect to French and Turkish language proficiency is observed. A means plot between self-rating scores for the two languages and ages shows that younger informants give higher ratings for their French skills but lower ratings for Turkish. This pattern was the reverse for the older informants. Especially concerning higher-level discourse skills,

Table 6. *Language attitudes towards Turkish (N = 175)* The scale is 1 (not important) to 5 (very important)

Importance of Turkish	Groups	N	Mean	S.D.
Friends	G1	111	2.63	1.34
	G2	64	3.51	1.45
Money	G1	111	2.18	1.41
	G2	64	2.04	1.49
Study	G1	108	2.59	1.35
	G2	63	2.12	1.56
Job	G1	111	2.43	1.47
	G2	64	1.71	1.41
Better education	G1	111	2.83	1.43
	G2	63	1.90	1.55
Life in France	G1	111	2.33	1.46
	G2	64	2.01	1.49
Esteem in society	G1	110	3.38	1.46
	G2	63	2.26	1.53
Children	G1	110	4.29	1.06
	G2	64	3.46	1.57
Acceptance in Turkish community	G1	109	4.55	.91
	G2	63	4.55	.92
Turkish friends	G1	111	3.16	1.29
	G2	63	3.90	1.29
Acceptance in French community	G1	109	1.87	1.34
	G2	63	1.74	1.41
Work	G1	110	2.11	1.36
	G2	63	2.06	1.60
Travel	G1	109	3.01	1.44
	G2	62	2.06	1.45
Trade	G1	109	2.96	1.47
	G2	63	1.93	1.47
Family	G1	108	4.50	.90
	G2	63	4.46	.99
Cultural survival	G1	110	4.69	.80
	G2	63	4.61	1.02
Identity	G1	107	4.37	1.08
	G2	63	4.57	1.10

such as taking part in a discussion on a controversial topic and stating and defending his/her views, younger informants' ratings were lower compared to older informants. Accordingly, in understanding the proverbs and idiomatic expressions in Turkish they have lower ratings compared to the first generation informants. On the other hand, older immigrants have much lower ratings for their French skills compared to younger informants. Findings on self-rating skills are highly in line with language use patterns, (Table 3) and with language choice patterns (Table 5), which

Table 7. *Results on self-rating scales for Turkish and French (N = 175).* The scale is 1 (can NOT do it) to 5 (can do it easily)

Self-rating scales:	Groups	Turkish			French		
I can . . .		N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.
Say the days of the week	G1	109	4.98	.13	109	5.00	.00
	G2	64	4.93	.50	63	4.93	.30
Count to hundred in the language	G1	109	4.94	.40	107	5.00	.00
	G2	64	4.95	.37	64	4.92	.41
Give the current date (day/month/year)	G1	109	4.82	.60	108	4.94	.42
	G2	64	5.00	.00	64	4.79	.64
Order a meal at a restaurant	G1	109	4.85	.44	108	4.93	.28
	G2	64	4.90	.38	64	4.26	1.30
Ask for directions on the street	G1	109	4.91	.36	108	4.98	.13
	G2	64	4.98	.12	64	4.62	.95
Buy clothes in a department store	G1	109	4.88	.40	108	4.99	E-02
	G2	63	4.96	.17	63	4.77	.70
Give detailed information about myself	G1	108	4.66	.61	108	4.97	.16
	G2	64	5.00	.00	64	4.17	1.36
Give information about the organs in the	G1	109	3.62	1.11	108	4.45	.83
body	G2	64	4.76	.61	64	3.60	1.49
Talk about my favorite hobby at some	G1	108	4.42	.85	107	4.86	.41
length, using appropriate vocabulary	G2	63	4.93	.30	63	3.76	1.46
Describe my present job, studies, or other	G1	109	4.38	.80	108	4.88	.34
major life activities in detail	G2	63	4.92	.32	63	3.92	1.52
Tell what I plan to be doing in 5 years	G1	108	4.08	.95	107	4.82	.49
from now, using appropriate future tenses	G2	64	4.85	.58	64	3.34	1.62
Describe the educational system	G1	108	3.56	1.15	107	4.66	.67
	G2	62	4.69	.75	61	3.01	1.56
State and support with examples and	G1	106	3.44	1.23	106	4.33	.99
reasons a position on a controversial topic	G2	64	4.28	1.21	64	2.93	1.56
Describe the role of parliament in the	G1	106	2.94	1.37	107	3.61	1.49
system of government and state	G2	63	3.98	1.41	63	2.66	1.56
Understand simple day-to-day talk	G1	108	4.66	.73	108	4.89	.36
	G2	64	4.95	.27	64	3.96	1.45
Understand and follow the speech of a	G1	107	4.46	.75	107	4.81	.41
competent native speaker	G2	64	4.85	.46	64	3.45	1.49
Comprehend jokes and ironies made in	G1	108	4.55	.82	107	4.87	.40
movies or comedies	G2	63	4.87	.58	63	3.44	1.59
Comprehend views and positions put	G1	109	4.11	1.05	108	4.64	.60
forward by speakers in a debate	G2	64	4.85	.46	64	2.96	1.65
Comprehend indirect messages, hints	G1	109	4.33	.87	108	4.76	.60
	G2	64	4.81	.70	64	2.96	1.62
Understand proverbs and sayings in the	G1	108	3.91	1.16	107	4.37	.84
language	G2	64	4.78	.72	64	2.70	1.65

shows that language proficiency and use-choice are highly interrelated but the relationship is not always unidirectional.

Ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions

Results of the ethnolinguistic vitality questionnaire show that both groups of Turkish informants generally give French higher vitality ratings than Turkish. Only on the variables, extent of in-group marriage, pride of cultural history, and language used in religious worship, both the younger and older informants give Turkish higher vitality ratings than French.

In general, almost on all the items, younger Turkish informants give Turkish higher vitality ratings than the older informants. On the other hand, the younger informants' ratings for French vitality are lower compared to older informants. The differences in vitality ratings for French and Turkish concerning the demographic and status factors are not so large as the differences for the institutional support factors. In terms of the

Table 8. *Turkish immigrants' ethnolinguistic vitality ratings of their own group and of the French (N = 175).* The scale is a 7-point scale, 1 indicates minimum vitality, while 7 indicates maximum vitality

SEVQ Variables	French Vitality		Turkish Vitality	
	G1	G2	G1	G2
1) Proportion of population	5.03	4.76	2.95	2.06
2) Perceived language status locally	6.57	6.33	3.51	2.51
3) Perceived language status internationally	5.38	5.41	2.81	1.87
4) Amount of French/Turkish in government services	6.72	6.89	1.76	1.30
5) French/Turkish birthrate	4.59	3.06	3.97	3.76
6) French/Turkish control over business	6.10	6.44	2.65	1.89
7) French/Turkish language in mass media	6.48	6.83	2.34	1.40
8) Perceived group status	5.16	6.16	2.51	3.70
9) Proportion of French/Turkish locally	4.92	5.19	3.97	2.80
10) French/Turkish language at school	6.65	6.89	2.69	2.00
11) French/Turkish immigration patterns	3.53	3.60	3.15	2.05
12) In-group marriage	3.97	4.41	5.93	6.14
13) French/Turkish political power	5.64	6.58	2.65	1.30
14) French/Turkish language in business	6.59	6.84	2.49	1.62
15) French/Turkish emigration pattern	3.57	3.30	2.61	1.74
16) Pride of cultural history	4.79	4.97	5.38	5.53
17) French/Turkish language of worship	4.90	4.95	5.77	5.92
18) Group's cultural representation	5.80	6.37	2.71	2.03
19) Perceived group strength	5.38	6.16	3.77	2.73
20) Group wealth	5.35	5.66	3.94	2.76
21) Predicted future strength	5.39	6.14	4.49	3.87

perceived contact between the mainstream community members and the Turkish group, the younger informants had higher ratings (*Mean* = 4.64) than the older counterparts (*Mean* = 3.42), which, in a way, indicates the integration level of both groups in the mainstream community.

Testing the hypotheses

Given the large number of variables in the three questionnaires, data reduction was needed for more advanced statistics. By means of the SPSS computing procedure, a sum score for each of the language use, preference, choice, and attitudes were obtained. In the same fashion, sum scores for self-rating scales (French and Turkish), vitality of Turkish and French were calculated. On the basis of this data reduction, total scores for each informant on these new scales were obtained. In order to identify internal-consistency estimation of the items in these scales, the variables were subjected to *reliability analysis.* The reliability coefficients obtained were very high. It was *alpha* = .85 for the language use scale (10 items); *alpha* = .95 for the language preference scale (10 items); *alpha* = .88 for the language choice scale (7 items); and *alpha* = .86 for the language attitudes scale (17 items). Accordingly, the reliability coefficients obtained for self-rating scale Turkish (20 items) *alpha* = .94 and for French (20 items) *alpha* = .97 were very high. There were 21 items in each of the Turkish and French vitality scales. The reliability coefficients for the Turkish vitality scale (*alpha* = .84) was rather high but for the French vitality scale it was comparatively lower (*alpha* = .71).

In order to test the two hypotheses stated earlier, an analysis of variance between younger (G1) and older informants' (G2) scores for language use (named USE), language preference (PREF), language attitudes (ATUDE), language choice (CHOICE), self-rating scale Turkish (SRTUR), self-rating scale French (SRFRE), Turkish vitality (VITUR), and French vitality (VITFR) was done. The following table summarises the results of an analysis of variance between the two groups of informants.

The first two hypotheses stated earlier are null hypotheses and an analysis of variance is the most relevant statistical procedure to test whether the group means are equal in the population, by comparing the sample variance estimated from the group means to that estimated within the groups. As opposed to our expectations, France-born second generation Turkish immigrants have more positive attitudes towards Turkish than older immigrants. There are significant differences between the two groups' scores concerning the importance of Turkish in France, and also the vitality of

Turkish. Especially concerning the vitality of Turkish in France, as presented in Table 9, the differences between the two groups' ratings are very large, which is also contrary to the assumption postulated in the second hypothesis because, as seen from the results, older immigrants do not have higher subjective vitality perceptions than younger immigrants.

In order to test the third hypothesis, language use, proficiency, attitudes, and choice scores of first and second-generation informants were correlated with subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions. As seen in Table 10, there is a highly significant positive correlation between language use, choice, and preference of the informants. There is also a signifi-

Table 9. *ANOVA results concerning intergenerational differences (N = 175)*

Dimension	Group	Mean	S.D.	F	P
Language use (USE)[a]	G1 (n = 111)	23.18	5.90		
	G2 (n = 64)	13.21	5.55	120.744	.000
	Total (N = 175)	19.54	7.51		
Language preference (PREF)[b]	G1 (n = 111)	37.02	9.84		
	G2 (n = 64)	19.75	10.00	123.638	.000
	Total (N = 175)	30.70	12.92		
Attitudes towards Turkish	G1 (n = 111)	53.24	12.60		
(ATUDE)[c]	G2 (n = 64)	48.39	13.22	5.803	.017
	Total (N = 175)	51.46	13.01		
Language choice (CHOICE)[d]	G1 (n = 111)	21.95	6.59		
	G2 (n = 64)	11.42	6.18	108.270	.000
	Total (N = 175)	18.10	8.20		
Self-rating scale Turkish	G1 (n = 109)	86.05	10.07		
(SRTUR)[e]	G2 (n = 64)	95.81	6.17	49.133	.000
	Total (N = 173)	89.66	10.00		
Self-rating scale French (SRFRE)[e]	G1 (n = 110)	92.76	13.39		
	G2 (n = 64)	74.75	21.21	47.128	.000
	Total (N = 174)	86.13	18.78		
Turkish vitality scale (VITUR)[f]	G1 (n = 111)	82.38	17.03		
	G2 (n = 64)	68.39	13.83	31.241	.000
	Total (N = 175)	77.26	17.27		
French vitality scale (VITFR)[f]	G1 (n = 111)	119.66	13.68		
	G2 (n = 64)	124.55	12.16	5.613	.019
	Total (N = 175)	121.44	13.32		

a. Mean values closer to 10 means only Turkish and values closer to 50 means only French language use.
b. Mean values closer to 10 means preference for Turkish while a value closer to 50 means preference for French language.
c. Mean values closer to 17 indicates low evaluation of Turkish while scores closer to 85 points to high evaluation.
d. Mean values closer to 7 indicate choice for Turkish while scores closer to 35 indicates choice for French.
e. Minimum score is 20 while maximum score is 100.
f. Minimum vitality score is 21 while maximum vitality score is 147.

Table 10. *Correlations between sociolinguistic dimensions and ethnolinguistic vitality scales*

	USE	PREF	ATUDE	CHOICE	SRTUR	SRFRE	VITUR	VITFR
USE	1.00							
PREF	.73**	1.00						
ATUDE	−.01	.040	1.00					
CHOICE	.69**	.78**	.017	1.00				
SRTUR	−.41**	−.45**	−.03	−.41**	1.00			
SRFRE	.49**	.48**	.13	.53**	−.17*	1.00		
VITUR	.23**	.32**	.35**	.17*	−.22**	.11	1.00	
VITFR	−.17*	−.11	−.04	−.05	.14	−.13	−.01	1.00

cant correlation between first language use and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish immigrants, which confirms our third hypothesis. Accordingly, there are significant correlations between Turkish vitality and language choice, attitudes, and preference scales. On the other hand, there is a significant negative relationship between self-rating of Turkish proficiency scale and language use, choice, and preference scales. This outcome is not so surprising because, irrespective of the proficiency level in Turkish, especially second-generation informants choose and use either Turkish or French with certain interlocutors, for example, Turkish with the parents but French with siblings and friends. Even if informants think that their Turkish is poor, they will still speak Turkish with their parents. This finding is contrary to some earlier assumptions that language proficiency exerts a particularly strong influence on language choice (Klatter-Folmer and Van Avermaet 2001). The findings of this study suggest that both the speaker's and the interlocutor's language use exert an influence on language choice. Accordingly, there is a significant negative relationship between the Turkish vitality scale and the Turkish self-rating scale. Younger informants rate their proficiency in Turkish lower compared to the older informants, but they have higher vitality ratings for Turkish than the older immigrants, which in a way shows the complicated interaction between language use-proficiency and ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions.

Discussion and conclusions

The findings of this study deepen our understanding of language contact situations and provide further empirical evidence of the relationship between ethnolinguistic vitality and language maintenance in ethnic communities. This research was designed to examine the effect of ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions on language maintenance, use, and choice on the part of Turkish immigrants in France. On the basis of the survey results, we have a better understanding of the factors that support

Turkish language maintenance. The findings show that Turkish is mostly spoken in the domestic domain and in the neighborhood with other Turkish immigrants. Similar to other immigration settings, such as Australia, Germany, and the Netherlands, Turkish immigrants in France concentrate in certain working-class suburbs, which provide them with a strong network of speakers of Turkish (Archibald 2002; Tribalat 1998). Like in other immigration settings (Karakasoglu 1996), Turkish religious organizations in France and especially mosques provide a strong network for the community. Even though there is very little institutional support from the mainstream community for first language maintenance, Turkish language mass media are readily available in France and combined with Turkish language teaching at schools, basic conditions for first language maintenance are available. The high rate of in-group marriages might be another factor contributing to first language maintenance. In most cases, Turkish persons born in France marry persons born in Turkey, which results in a continued inflow of first-generation immigrants. Thus, Turkish does not lose its dominant role in the domestic domain and children born into those families acquire Turkish as their first language. The main findings of this study also agree with those of the Multilingual Cities Project (Akinci et al., in press; Extra et al. 2001) in that Turkish youngsters are reasonably proficient in Turkish. As shown with data from the Dutch context, Turkish has the highest vitality score of all immigrant minority languages in the Netherlands.

In testing the hypotheses, it could be shown that younger informants have more positive attitudes towards Turkish than the older informants. It was also shown that Turkish informants in France rated their in-group vitality lower, as compared to French. Younger informants' ratings of Turkish vitality, however, were higher compared to first-generation informants. Accordingly, younger informants reported more positive attitudes towards Turkish than the older informants. However, older and younger informants differ in their Turkish/French language use and choice patterns. Younger informants prefer French in most domains; it is only with their parents that they mostly speak Turkish. Language shift to French is apparent among younger informants, which supports the assumption that the dominant language will replace mother tongues of communities with low ethnolinguistic vitality. Nevertheless, low ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions alone cannot account for language shift. For, compared with younger informants, older informants have even lower EV ratings for the in-group but they seem to use Turkish in all domains with various interlocutors. In the literature, it is argued that low vitality perceptions can either lead to linguistic assimilation or to language maintenance, but this assumption is not necessarily valid in all language contact situations (Bourhis and Sachdev 1984; Johnson et al. 1983; Saint-Blancat 1985).

Turkish immigrants in other immigration contexts have different vitality ratings for the in-group (Yagmur et al. 1999; Yagmur, to appear in 2004). Thus, immigrant minority groups develop more than one strategy in language contact settings. They may systematically minimize or exaggerate the vitality of their own or other groups, depending on how much they identify with their own group, on their degree of social interaction with in- and out-group members, on their language choice in various settings, and on whether they regard intergroup settings as positive or negative (Bourhis et al. 1981; Leets and Giles 1995; Sachdev et al. 1987). Furthermore, it is suggested that group survival and language maintenance are dependent on the perceptions and behavior of succeeding generations of ethnolinguistic groups (Sachdev et al. 1987). Reitz (cited in Sachdev et al. 1987) reports on the status of Chinese in Canada. Although Chinese is used by first-generation immigrants widely, it is less prevalent among the second generation and almost nonexistent in the third generation. Akinci et al. (in press) found high first language proficiency among third-generation Turkish primary school children in Lyon. Such findings necessitate a reconsideration of the concept of subjective ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions and its relationship to language use.

Finally, in spite of large differences between Turkish proficiency of older and younger informants, second-generation informants have more positive attitudes towards Turkish and also higher vitality ratings for the in-group than first-generation immigrants, which also points to differences between language dominance and language preference. The findings in the Dutch context show that Turkish youngsters' language preference and dominance change over time, and there is not always a one-to-one correlation between dominance and preference (Extra et al. 2002). This study has shown that Turkish remains to be a core value for self-identification among Turkish immigrants in France, even if there is language shift among second-generation immigrants.

Babylon, Tilburg University, The Netherlands
Dynamiques Sociolangagières (UMR 6065 CNRS), Rouen, France

References

Akinci, M. A. (1996). Les pratiques langagières chez les immigrés turcs en France. *Écarts d'Identité*, 76, 14–17.

— (1999). *Développement des compétences narratives des enfants bilingues turc-français en France âgés de 5 à 10 ans.* Ph.D. dissertation, Université Lumière Lyon 2. (To appear: Lincom Europa, Munich).

—; de Ruiter, J. J.; and Sanagustin, F. (in press). *Plurilinguisme à Lyon: Le statut des langues à la maison et à l'école.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Allard, R.; and Landry, R. (1986). Subjective ethnolinguistic vitality viewed as a belief system. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 7(1), 1–11.

Archibald, J. (2002). Immigrant integration: the ongoing process of reform in France and Québec. In *Language Policy: Lessons from Global Models*, S.J. Baker (ed.), 30–58. Monterey: Monterey Institute.

Bourdieu, P. (1982). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information* 16, 645–668.

Bourhis, R. Y.; Giles, H.; and Rosenthal, D. (1981). Notes on the construction of a 'subjective vitality questionnaire' for Ethnolinguistic Groups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2(2), 145–155.

—; and Sachdev, I. (1984). Vitality perceptions and language attitudes: some Canadian data. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 3(2), 97–127.

Brabant, J. (1992). Une insertion économique problématique. *Hommes et Migrations* 1153, 34–38.

Clark, J. L. (1981). Language. In *College Students' Knowledge and Beliefs: A Survey of Global Understanding*, T. S. Barrows (ed.), 25–35, 87–100. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press.

Clyne, M. (1991). *Community Languages: The Australian Experience.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Echardour, A.; and Maurin, E. (1993). La main d'oeuvre étrangère. *Données sociales*, 504–513.

Extra, G.; Aarts, R.; Avoird, T.; Broeder, P.; and Yagmur, K. (2001). *Meertaligheid in Den Haag: De status van allochtone talen thuis en op school.* Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation.

—; Aarts, R.; Avoird, T.; Broeder, P.; and Yagmur, K. (2002). *De andere talen van Nederland: thuis en op school.* Bussum: Coutinho.

Fishman, J. (1965). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry. *Linguistics* 9, 32–70.

Giles, H.; Bourhis, R.Y.; and Taylor, D.M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*, H. Giles (ed.), 307–348. London: Academic Press.

—; Rosenthal, D.; and Young, L. (1985). Perceived ethnolinguistic vitality: the Anglo- and Greek-Australian setting. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6(3/4), 253–269.

Haarmann, H. (1986). *Language in Ethnicity: A View of Basic Ecological Relations.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Husband, C.; and Saifullah Khan, V. (1982). The viability of ethnolinguistic vitality: some creative doubts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 3 (3), 193–205.

Hyltenstam, K.; and Stroud, C. (1996). Language maintenance. In *Contact Linguistics*, Goebl et al. (eds.), 567–578. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Institut National de la Statistique et des Études Économiques (INSEE) (1997). *Les Immigrés en France.* Paris: INSEE.

Johnson, P.; Giles, H.; and Bourhis, R. Y. (1983). The viability of ethnolinguistic vitality: a reply. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 4(4), 255–269.

Karakasoglu, Y. (1996). Turkish cultural orientations in Germany and the role of Islam. In *Turkish Culture in German Society Today*, D. Horrocks and E. Kolinsky (eds.), 157–179. Providence: Berghahn Books.

Kipp, S.; Clyne, M.; and Pauwels, A. (1995). *Immigration and Australia's Language Resources.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Klatter-Folmer, J.; and Van Avermaet, P. (2001). Social determinants of language shift amongst ethnic minority groups: the role of self-assessment of L2 proficiency. In *Sociolinguistic and Psycholinguistic Perspectives on Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages*, T. Ammerlaan, M. Hulsen, H. Strating, and K. Yagmur (eds.), 203–219. Berlin and New York: Waxmann.

Kloss, H. (1966). German American language maintenance efforts. In *Language Loyalty in the United States*, J. A. Fishman (ed.). The Hague: Mouton.

Lapeyronne, D. (1990). Introduction. In *Les politiques locales d'intégration de minorités en Europe et aux Etats-Unis*, D. Lapeyronne (ed.). Paris: Agence pour le développement des relations interculturelles (ADRI).

Leets, L.; and Giles, H. (1995). Dimensions of minority language survival/non-survival: intergroup cognitions and communication climates. In *The State of Minority Languages: International Perspectives on Survival and Decline*, W. Fase, K. Jaspaert, and S. Kroon (eds.), 37–73. Lisse: Sweets and Zeitlenger B.V.

Major, R.C. (1992). Losing English as a first language. *The Modern Language Journal* 76, 190–208.

Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement.* London: Pinter Publishers.

Pittam, J.; Gallois, C.; and Willemyns, M. (1991). Perceived change in ethnolinguistic vitality by dominant and minority subgroups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12(6), 449–457.

Sachdev, I.; Bourhis, R.; Phang, S.; and D'Eye, J. (1987). Language attitudes and vitality perceptions: intergenerational effects amongst Chinese Canadian communities. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 6(3/4), 287–307.

Saint-Blancat, C. (1985). The effect of minority group vitality upon its sociopsychological behavior and strategies. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6(1), 31–45.

Smolicz, J. J. (1981). Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4, 75–90.

Tollefson, J. W. (1991). *Planning Language, Planning Inequality.* London: Longman.

Tribalat, M. (1998). Populations originaires de Turquie en France. In *Toute la France, Histoire de l'immigration en France au XX siècle*, L. Gervereau, P. Milza, and E. Temine (eds.). Paris: Somogy.

Villanova de, R. (1997) Turkish housing conditions in France: from tenant to owner. In *Turks in European Cities: Housing and Urban Segregation. Comparative Studies in Migration and Ethnic Relations 4*, ERCOMER, S. Özüekren and R. Van Kempen (eds.), 98–121. Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Willemyns, M.; Pittam, J.; and Gallois, C. (1993). Perceived ethnolinguistic vitality of Vietnamese and English in Australia: a confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 14(6), 481–497.

Yagmur, K. (1997). *First Language Attrition among Turkish Speakers in Sydney.* Studies in Multilingualism 7. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

— (to appear in 2004). Language maintenance patterns of Turkish immigrant communities in Australia and Western Europe: the impact of majority attitudes on ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language.*

—; de Bot, K.; and Korzilius, H. (1999). Language attrition, language shift and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 20(1), 51–69.