

Turkish as a minority language in Germany: aspects of language development and language instruction

Almut Küppers¹, Yazgül Şimşek², Christoph Schroeder³

Dieser Beitrag vermittelt einen Überblick über Sprecherzahlen, Entwicklung, Verwendung und unterrichtliche Aspekte des Türkischen in Deutschland. Teil 1 beschäftigt sich mit den Spezifika des Erwerbs und der Verwendung des Türkischen als Minderheitensprache in Deutschland. Teil 2 diskutiert die Frage, ob sich eine neue Varietät des Türkischen in Deutschland herausgebildet hat und Teil 3 befasst sich mit der Entwicklung, der Lage und den Aussichten des Türkischen als Schulfach. Teil 4 fasst die Ergebnisse zusammen und bezieht sie aufeinander.

1. Introduction

Turkish is a pervasive minority language in Germany spoken around the country. Not only is it frequently heard in urban centres but it can also be seen displayed on shop signs, posters and in announcements. Moreover, Turkish is present in public spaces in Germany as a language used for advertising, not only in newspapers and books but also on various radio and TV stations that broadcast in Turkish (Foertsch & Jessen 2007). To a limited extent it is also a school subject and is learnt as both a heritage and foreign language.

However, unlike German and minority languages such as Romani and regional minority languages such as Frisian, Sorbian or Danish, Turkish (just like Russian, Polish, Arabic and many other languages spoken in Germany) is not protected by legal documents in Germany. Domains of the use of Turkish in Germany are predominantly informal settings.

-
- 1 Korrespondenzadresse: Dr. Almut Küppers, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Institut für England- und Amerikastudien / currently: Istanbul Policy Center, Sabanci University, Minerva Han Headquarter, 34420 Istanbul / Karaköy, Turkey, E-Mail: a.kueppers@em.uni-frankfurt.de / almutkueppers@sabanciuniv.edu
 - 2 Korrespondenzadresse: Dr. Yazgül Şimşek, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Germanistisches Institut, Centrum für Mehrsprachigkeit und Spracherwerb, Robert-Koch-Str. 29, 48149 Münster, E-Mail: simseky@uni-muenster.de
 - 3 Korrespondenzadresse: Prof. Dr. Christoph Schroeder, Universität Potsdam, Zentrum Sprache, Variation, Migration (SVM), Am Neuen Palais 10, 14469 Potsdam, E-Mail: schroedc@uni-potsdam.de

The history of the spread and use of Turkish in Germany is relatively recent: Its beginnings can be dated to the intensification of labour migration from Turkey to Germany starting with the bilateral recruitment agreement between Germany and Turkey in 1961.⁴

Today, families with Turkish origin live in Germany in the third generation.⁵ The term "generations" should not be understood as a simple linear sequence: In the biographies of the second, sometimes even the third generation, we often find a stay of several years in Turkey; that is, children live in Turkey for some time with a parent or with relatives, be this before they start school or even at certain stages during schooling. Even after the expiry of the recruitment agreement in 1973, new immigration from Turkey continued unabatedly, initially within the scope of family reunification, today mainly through marriage migration, and in the 1980s and 1990s also as a consequence of the civil war in the Kurdish areas of Southeast Turkey. But above all, contact between speakers of Turkish in Germany and those in Turkey continues and intensifies in a growing German-Turkish transnational space (Küppers et al. 2015).

Due to the complex history of the spread of Turkish in Germany, it is of course difficult to provide speaker numbers. Turkish citizenship as a baseline leads to problematic figures,⁶ not only because of the measures being taken to facilitate German and dual citizenship, but also because the ratio between naturalization or citizenship and language use is difficult to determine. Turkish citizens living in Germany may prefer German as their family language, or Turkish, a minority language of Turkey, or two or all three of these; the same also applies for German citizens of Turkish origin.

Reliable numbers of speakers therefore cannot be based on statistics which deal with labels such as citizenship, ethnic belongings or "migration background", but should be based directly on surveys questioning language use (Chlosta & Ostermann 2005). Recent home language surveys from primary schools offer such figures, such as the SPREEG Survey in Essen (Chlosta et

4 As is well known, this was due to a shortage of workers during the *Wirtschaftswunder* ("economic miracle") in the 1950s and 1960s and similar agreements were concluded between Germany and Italy in 1955, Greece in 1960, Morocco in 1963, Portugal in 1964, Tunisia in 1965 and Yugoslavia in 1968.

5 We make a distinction in the present text between the first generation, the "intergeneration" (as in Backus 1996), the second and the third generation. The first generation comprises the young adults coming as "guest workers" as they were then called. The "intergeneration" is made up of those who came to Germany as teenagers in the course of family reunification, while the second and third generations were born in Germany.

6 1.61 million foreigners living in Germany at the end of 2011 had Turkish nationality, which corresponded to nearly a quarter of all foreigners living in Germany; cf. http://www.bpb.de/wissen/IR34EG,0,Ausl%E4ndische_Bev%F6lkerung_nach_Staatsangeh%F6rigkeit.html, accessed 30.01.2015.

al. 2003), the Multilingual Cities Survey in Hamburg (Fürstenau et al. 2003) and the FreiSprachen Survey in Freiburg (Decker & Schnitzer 2012). These surveys tell us that Turkish is one of the largest minority languages spoken in Germany, if not the largest.⁷

In this article, some aspects of Turkish in Germany will be considered. Part 1 summarizes findings on the acquisition and use of Turkish in Germany. Part 2 discusses structural aspects of Turkish in Germany and Part 3 addresses the situation of Turkish as a school subject. Part 4 summarizes and discusses the findings.⁸

2. Acquisition and use

We stated in the introduction that the domains of use of Turkish in Germany were predominantly informal. This terminology is based on a distinction put forward by Maas (2008, 2010), who distinguishes between the social dimensions of "formality" and "intimacy", namely the formal public situation of social institutions, informal everyday interaction at work, in the street and at the market, and finally the intimate domain of linguistic interaction within the family or among friends. These are related to those varieties of a language that correlate with the social situation to be mastered linguistically.

Table 1: Differentiation of registers according to Maas (2008, 2010)

Intimacy		Formality	
		- (informal)	+ (formal)
	- (public)	Market, street ...	Social institutions
	+ (intimate)	Family, peers ...	

The intimate, informal public and formal public registers develop in an individual along with socialisation: S/he acquires the intimate register within the family, gradually develops informal public social relations as s/he grows up and starts to acquire the formal register at the latest when s/he goes to school.

7 Percentage of Turkish speakers among multilingual children in the surveys: SPREEG Survey: 30% (largest group); Multilingual Cities Survey: 32% (largest group); FreiSprachen Survey Freiburg: 7% (seventh largest group).

8 We are grateful to Dominic Scaife for carefully proofreading the final draft of this text.

Applied to Turkish in Germany, it can be assumed that language acquisition in the intimate and informal registers begins within the family. Later on it expands in interaction within the network of Turkish relations and acquaintances and – depending on local conditions – also in shops, on the street, at the market and passively also through the media. Turkish in Germany is therefore initially and conceptually oral; moreover, it is in close contact with German from the very beginning: Speakers of Turkish usually acquire German as an early second language at kindergarten, through their German-speaking environment, from their elder siblings and from the media. At least by the time the children start school, they start to acquire the formal register of German. Exposure to the formal register of Turkish remains limited. However, there is certain provision at school for the acquisition of the formal register of Turkish (see part 4).

Turkish in Germany thus develops in super-diverse urban centres where multilingualism is a prevailing feature. This has a number of consequences. For one thing, the language contact situation plus the fact that orate structures of Turkish are very much part of speakers' repertoires have led to consequences with regard to the path of acquisition of the language, including literacy acquisition, which in turn have led to structural changes in the language system. These issues are addressed in part 3 below.

Also, speakers of Turkish make use of their German as a resource for code mixing, code switching and loan translations. Language mixing of Turkish and German, in particular with younger speakers, has been analysed in various ways. Hinnenkamp (2005) coined the term of "blurred genre" for the mixed speech of Turkish-German bilinguals and stresses it to be a variety in its own right with specific functions in discourse, mainly as a resource for handling interaction playfully. On the other hand, important ethnographic sociolinguistic research carried out in Mannheim at the *Institut für Deutsche Sprache* (IDS) shows high intra-community variability in speech styles, with different styles being associated with different group identity constructions (cf. Keim & Cindark 2003, Keim 2007). Backus (2005) also underlines the consequences of language mixing (calques, loan translations, code mixing, code switching) for language change (see also part 3).

The presence of Turkish in German society has furthermore opened the gates for Turkish as a resource in instances of "crossing" (Rampton 1995) and/or polylingual "languaging" (Jørgensen 2008). Elements of the Turkish language entering the language of the youth have led to the emergence of ethnic styles (Selting & Kern 2009) and varieties which young people use who are not (only) of Turkish origin (Androutsopoulos 2001, Dirim & Auer 2004, Wiese 2013).

The popular myth of "double semilingualism" is another facet surrounding the use of Turkish in Germany with a subtle but enduring impact particularly on the second and third generation of speakers.⁹ Their own uncertainties regarding their Turkish language skills can even result in a matter of shame when in public discourse – and even in parts of academic circles – these skills are depicted as being deficient and faulty. The common misconception becomes fuelled by the German media which likes to deny these speakers a profound knowledge of both German and Turkish.¹⁰

3. Turkish in Germany – a new Turkish dialect?

As stated above, Turkish in Germany is conceptually oral and influenced by the German that the children learn at kindergarten, through the media and other sources of input in their German-speaking environment. The specific language contact situation certainly results in linguistic differences between monolingual speakers of Turkish in Turkey and bilingual speakers in Germany. At the level of the individual speaker these can be described as differences in the acquisition process because the input is mainly bilingual and lacks elements of the formal Turkish register.¹¹ Moreover, there are differences in terms of repertoire (Johanson 1991) as speakers can draw from a continuum between monolingual mode in both languages and different degrees of language mixing. We therefore agree with Backus (2003) that Turkish in Germany is not a mixed language in itself but rather that "mixed lects" form part of the speakers' repertoire and are characterized by a high degree of variability.

However, Turkish-German contact phenomena do not exhaust themselves in code switches or code mixes but also become evident in structural changes to the language system itself. In this respect, Rehbein et al. (2009) plead for a new inventory of Turkish in Germany owing to the contact with German which functions as a "catalyst language" that is simultaneously activated in

9 See the critical analysis of this by Wiese 2010.

10 Unfortunately, this pathological view of bilingualism seems to form an unholy alliance with normative perceptions of language and its relation to society and identity formation among parts of the Turkish community itself. If the written standard language of Turkish (*Türkçemiz* = our Turkish) in the sense of a "mother tongue" (*anadil*) is used as the reference point for belonging, anyone who does not master his/her mother tongue at this level can therefore be questioned. This serves to turn Turkish skills into cultural capital reserved for the intellectual elite leaders of the first generation of Turks in Germany which inevitably devalues the Turkish used by younger generations (cf. Schroeder 2003, 2006).

11 See Reich (2009) for a concise overview.

language processing phases. As such, German can affect Turkish by causing bilinguals either to develop new forms or to use existing ones in different ways. Persistent language contact can therefore eventually result in a gradual loss of forms and the creation of new ones.

Boeschoten (2000) identifies four dynamics of language change present in Turkish as spoken in the Netherlands:

- generalization of structural elements of spoken Turkish,
- generalization of structures which have equivalents in Dutch (~ convergence)
- levelling of differences between the dialects brought from Turkey,
- innovations which systemize the integration of lexical elements from the contact language.

While the general linguistic framework is still a subject of discussion amongst linguists, at the same time quite a few observations with regard to the peculiarities of Western European Turkish (mostly Turkish in the Netherlands and Germany) have been made. Below we summarize some observations made so far concerning variability in language structures which could potentially be considered characteristics of an emerging new variety "Germany Turkish":

3.1 Phonetics/Phonology

At present, very little is known about interferences from German at the segmental level which would cause a kind of foreign accent in the Turkish spoken by bilinguals in Germany. At the level of prosody, however, innovative features seem to have reached quite a high degree of stability. In her analysis of narrative discourse patterns, Queen (2001, 2006) identifies (rising) patterns in the Turkish sentential prosody of Turkish-German bilingual children and adolescents. These are high levels of fundamental frequency patterns which at least in their high frequency are atypical of both German and Turkish and are assigned to utterances in order to create tension in narrative sequences.¹²

12 See also Schroeder & Şimşek (2010) who report on similar rising patterns in spoken picture descriptions and storytellings of bilingual primary schoolchildren.

3.2 Morphology and Syntax

There is strong empirical evidence in the Turkish as spoken in Western Europe which points to morphological change and loss of forms. As for the structure of the noun phrase, changes in possessive constructions, namely overgeneralization of adnominal possessives as opposed to genitive marking, loss of the possessive compound marker (Türker 2005) and loss of noun phrase-internal linking devices (Schroeder 2014) are observed. Boeschoten (1990) also reports on the loss of genitive case marking in modal constructions, in the marking of subjects of nominalized subordinated structures and in building compound word units, and Şimşek & Schroeder (2011) point towards possible changes in the use of adverbial case markers. A case in point regarding the levelling of dialects from Turkey is the instrumental case suffix: While the standard form is (y)la / (y)le, a different form, *len / lan*, is typically observed in the spoken Turkish in Western Europe which in Turkey is a feature of East Anatolian dialects (Boeschoten 2000, Schroeder & Şimşek 2011). As for syntax, the tendency in the Turkish spoken in Germany to make redundant use of subject pronouns has been discussed on various occasions in the literature and is attributed to the contact with German that always requires the subject position to be overtly filled (Pfaff 1993, Doğruöz & Backus 2009). Regarding word order, studies have outlined a tendency towards the use of post-verbal constructions also for new and/or focussed elements (Doğruöz & Backus 2007).

In light of the tendencies and variations occurring in comparison to Turkish in Turkey, one main general characteristic of Turkish in Germany can be inferred in addition to the influence of German, namely the unique relation between prosody and syntax that arises from the predominantly spoken form that causes speakers to be prone to drop elements and compensate or create meaning via intonation in discourse. Such an example is given by Cindark & Aslan (2004: 4):

(1a) park-taki kadın-lar↑ (.) dedikodu-lar-ı ne üzer-in-e↑
 park-LOC.ATTR woman-PL gossip-PL-POSS what up-POSS-DAT
 "The women in the park. What are their gossips about?"

(1b) standard version of (1a)
 Park-taki kadın-lar-in dedikodu-lar-ı ne üzer-in-e?
 park-LOC.ATTR woman-PL-GEN gossip-PL-POSS what up-POSS-DAT

According to standard Turkish, the noun *kadınlar* ("women") in (1a) would require genitive case marking, especially when represented as a single sentence in writing as in (1b). The missing suffix is not a hindrance to understanding

because the speaker's turn is divided into several smaller units not intended to form a whole sentence and unit boundaries are signalled through rising intonation (↑) and a short pause (.). The use of such a strategy results in a lesser need for overt compound material and grammatical elements; such paratactic constructions are linked together via linking elements. This is also in line with the observations made by Rehbein et al. (2009), who note a replacement of syntactic means of clause linkage and subordination by juxtaposition and conjunction linkage in the Turkish of bilingual speakers in Germany.

There are some further traits of Turkish in Germany at the morphological level that could be described as stabilization of phenomena typical for the early stages of Turkish language acquisition. One such conspicuous feature is the use of the possessive suffix by adolescents in instances where it is redundant as in the following example:

- (2) Kopya çek-mek başka insan-ın *hakk-ı-sın-ı
 copy take-INF other person-GEN right-POSS-POSS-ACC
 yi-yor-sun say-ıl-ır
 take-IPFV-2SG count-PASS-AOR
 "To take a copy means you are violating other peoples' rights."

This additive possessive marking occurs when the form of the possessive suffix (*/u/i/ü*) which in the form of a single vowel occurs only after stems ending in consonants, is not analysed as such, and consequently, the possessive suffix which occurs after stems ending in vowels (*si(n)/su(n)/si(n)/sü(n)*) is added onto it. While such constructions are frequent in monolingual Turkish child language up until primary school age in Turkey, they can also be heard from bilingual adolescents in Germany (Şimşek & Schroeder 2011).¹³

3.3 Lexicon

The lexicon of Turkish in Germany at first glance seems not to differ in principle from that of speakers in Turkey. Speakers might initially be expected to have lexical gaps, especially due to semantically specific expressions newly incorporated into the Turkish lexicon in Turkey. However, these are overcome with *passé-partout* words and code-switching in discourse. The word *şey* or (*bir*)*şey* ("thing") is most commonly employed and is also used as a discourse-organising word in spoken colloquial Turkish in Turkey (cf.

13 Interestingly, children who acquire Turkish as an early second language in Turkey also seem to make use of the redundant possessive. This shows that its occurrence and/or stabilization in the Turkish variety in Germany is probably based on parameters of input frequency.

Şimşek 2012, Schroeder 2002). Nonetheless, some changes do occur in this area, including the use of the reflexive pronoun *kendi-* as a focus marker, which Schroeder (2014) interprets as taking over the function of the German focus particle *selbst* by way of convergence. Another phenomenon in the lexicon is changing patterns in the relationship between lexical elements. One such example is the use of the verbs *demek* and *söylemek*, which both refer to acts of speaking, where *demek* integrates direct and *söylemek* indirect speech. This distinction seems to be blurred in the Turkish of young bilingual speakers in Germany, resulting in utterances such as example (3) which would be inappropriate in the Turkish spoken in Turkey because *demek* would be required here:

- (3) Söylü-yor-lar ki 'hausordnung yaz-acak-sınız'.
 say-IPFV-PL that GERM|house.rules write-FUT-2PL
 "They are saying that you have to write down the rules of the house."

Another example of changing lexical patterns is the employment of the two light verbs *etmek* and *yapmak* (both meaning "to do" / "make") which are used to integrate German lexical elements into the language (see Pfaff 2000).

3.4 Literacy

The consequences of the specific contact situation of Turkish in Germany for the acquisition of Turkish literacy and maintenance of a Turkish literacy culture (*Schriftkultur*) are to a large extent unexplored. As for the acquisition of literacy, Schroeder & Şimşek (2010) find tendencies of separate spellings of suffixes in the Turkish texts of bilingual primary school pupils, and these allow the conclusion to be drawn that the children apply an interpretation of the orthographic word which is influenced by German orthographic principles. This in turn suggests that the dynamics of the acquisition of Turkish literacy in the bilingual context follow different traits than in the monolingual context of Turkey (cf. Menz & Schroeder forthc.). In the higher grades at school this orthographic variation has been more or less levelled out (Schroeder & Dollnick 2013) apart from a few notable exceptions concerning separate spellings of enclitics and the use of in-sentence capitals, which suggest that similar processes of language contact as those attested for the spoken language can also be identified in written Turkish in Germany (Schroeder 2007). Most of all, however, Schroeder & Dollnick (2013) and also Dirim (2009) identify an uncertainty among writers regarding the formal register – apparent also when the respective pupils have received Turkish instruction at school.

Among others, these uncertainties result in structures which from the point of view of written standard Turkish would appear hyperbolic.

However, many of the phenomena mentioned above are only attested for children still at the acquisition stage and observations are mostly based on the analysis of only a small number of speakers. Since evidence of use in adult speech and the distribution of these deviations is largely missing, none of them can yet be considered as stable features of Turkish in Germany. Claiming the emergence of a systematic variety of "Germany Turkish" that is clearly different from its parent variety in Turkey therefore still presupposes further investigations and linguistic analysis of the language used in different social domains. Such research faces a number of methodological obstacles (Aarsen et al. 2006, Backus 2012, Şimşek & Schroeder 2011, Schroeder 2014). Amongst these are:

- methodological problems of comparison between bilinguals and monolinguals and of the use of standard Turkish (and not the spoken Turkish of Turkey) as a yardstick for assessing differences between Turkish in Turkey and Turkish in Western Europe,
- problems of determining trends for grammatical changes in a situation where changes tend to present themselves in the form of increased frequency of constructions or idiosyncratic shifts of preferences of a speaker in favour of one construction over another equivalent one,
- problems of determining whether a particular feature is a property of a particular register or lect and not of the variety as a whole (if such a thing exists).

Another challenge, of course, is that of the theoretical implications of the identified dynamics of contact and change. Do we interpret our findings in line with recent heritage language research which considers changes in these languages to result from incomplete acquisition (Montrul 2008, Polinsky 2006 and for Turkish Bayram 2013)?¹⁴ Do we understand Turkish in Germany to be on the way towards becoming a mixed language? Do we see a systematic typological shift at work, leading to new form-function relations and a tendency towards a more analytical syntax as suggested by Rehbein et al. (2009)?

14 In the heritage language approach, "heritage language" is used as a term for what in other research is called an migrant or allochthonous minority language (cf. Bayram 2013).

4. Turkish heritage language teaching¹⁵

Turkish heritage language teaching (*Herkunftssprachenunterricht*) is mostly found at elementary level¹⁶ and taught until the end of grade 4 (until the end of grade 6 only in Berlin and Brandenburg). Based on official policy resolutions issued by the ministries of education and cultural affairs in the respective federal German states (*Bundesländer*), it was institutionalized nearly forty years ago. Sometimes answerable to the respective Turkish consulate in a federal German state and sometimes to the ministry of education and cultural affairs, various curricula have emerged for which either the respective federal state, the Turkish Ministry of Education (Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı 2000) or the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs in the Federal Republic of Germany (KMK) are responsible. The degree of integration of Turkish heritage language teaching into the overall lesson plan of schools varies considerably between the federal states. For example, while in Hamburg, Bremen and North Rhine-Westphalia (NRW) Turkish is a fully integrated subject alongside the heritage language teaching of other languages¹⁷, the Turkish lessons administered by the Turkish consulates in Berlin and Schleswig-Holstein are almost entirely organized as extracurricular clubs that are not integrated into lesson syllabuses and take place in the afternoon. Learners usually do not receive grades, and at best participation will be mentioned in report cards. In any case, Turkish instruction is provided only if a certain number of participants are registered.¹⁸

In a few schools (to our knowledge six elementary schools in Berlin, one in Cologne and one in Frankfurt), Turkish heritage language instruction also exists in the form of coordinated German-Turkish literacy education at the elementary level in year 1 and sometimes in year 2 as well. After year 1 (or 2), these classes are integrated into mainstream schooling.

Some German federal states (Bavaria, Berlin, Bremen, Hamburg, Hessen, Lower Saxony, NRW, Saxony) also offer Turkish heritage speakers the opportunity to opt for Turkish language instruction instead of a second or third foreign language at the lower and upper secondary levels. Turkish is also a

15 Labelling Turkish instruction is also a challenge because distinctions between "heritage" and "foreign" language teaching cannot be clearly drawn. Using participants as a qualifier seems as difficult as using the language itself as a baseline. However, we will nonetheless stick to the term "heritage" as it is a set term pointing to the historical implications in the context of migration.

16 For example in NRW 72% of heritage language lessons take place at the primary level cf. Schmitz & Olfert (2013: 217).

17 See Löser & Woerfel (forthc.) for an overview.

18 In North Rhine-Westphalia (NRW) 15 learners at elementary level and 19 at secondary level; in Lower Saxony 10 learners from one school or 18 from multiple schools.

possible subject as part of the leaving examination (*Abitur*) in NRW, Berlin, Bremen, Hamburg and Lower Saxony.¹⁹ We know of only one school in Germany, the Carl-von-Ossietzky School in Berlin, with a CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) offered for heritage speakers of Turkish at secondary level (for biology, history, geography and the social sciences). Last but not least there are also a few vocational schools which have integrated Turkish for specific purposes as part of training programs in the field of office administration or healthcare.²⁰

It is difficult to provide exact numbers of those receiving Turkish instruction in Germany as official figures issued by the individual federal states are hard to access.²¹ However, figures available from the German education authorities point to a general trend which indicates that participation in Turkish classes has decreased since the turn of the millennium. The numbers provided by the Turkish embassy suggest an even more dramatic slump in participant numbers; here our tentative conclusion is that we can assume a decline in participation of a quarter to a third for the same period of time over the past decade.²²

As for the teachers of Turkish as a heritage language, we can distinguish four groups: One group is formed by employees of the German education authorities who are trained in Turkey. These are mostly Turkish teachers working in elementary schools. They have usually been trained, tested and certified in Turkey and received some kind of on-the-job training from the local German education authorities. As these teachers are only qualified to teach one subject, they cannot be employed as civil servants and work as employees with a considerably lower income. The second group comprises employees or civil servants employed by the German authorities who have

19 However, even here the situation is not quite clear. A recent survey (Schmitz & Olfert 2013) does not mention Berlin and Bavaria but adds Hessen at the higher secondary level.

20 Cf. <http://www.osz-louise-schroeder.de/html/proturkiye.htm>, accessed 30.01.2015.

21 In an analysis on which this overview is based (Küppers et al. 2014), all German federal states were approached with the request to disclose participant and teacher numbers for Turkish classes. Some federal states do not maintain such statistics, some feedback was inconsistent, some overlaps with figures provided by the consulates and some states ignored the request altogether. In our eyes, this points to the difficulty of most of the federal states in Germany in coming to terms with heritage language instruction as a type of lesson which does not (yet) fit into the overall scheme of school lessons.

22 It is important to note that our estimates are very tentative: In all, we presently assume a total number of no more than 100,000 to 120,000 participants in Turkish heritage lessons in Germany. With approx. 300,000 learners, this number was almost three times as high around the turn of the millennium, i.e. shortly after PISA 2000 and just before 9/11. Our estimates are based on Reich & Hienz de Albenitzi (1998) and Schmitz & Olfert (2013: 218) as well as the figures supplied by the Turkish embassy. For more details see Küppers et al. (2014).

undergone teacher training for Turkish in Germany. The only university department in Germany which provides full academic teacher training for Turkish teachers – only for the lower and higher secondary levels – is Turkish Studies (*Türkistik*) at the University of Duisburg-Essen²³ (NRW) which has been in existence since 1995. Three additional universities offer Turkish teacher training as an extension of other programs (*Teilstudiengang* or *Erweiterungsfach*), namely Hamburg University²⁴ (at all levels), Tübingen University (only *Gymnasium*)²⁵, and the Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich (only *Gymnasium*).²⁶ Hamburg University used to be the only place in Germany where Turkish teachers could be trained for the elementary level – unfortunately, this program is in the process of being withdrawn (cf. Neumann 2014). The third group of teachers of Turkish in Germany is made up of employees or civil servants who are trained and employed in Germany but lack any qualification to teach Turkish. Since the overall majority of federal states does not offer teacher training for Turkish, they mostly rely on teachers with a so-called migration background to provide Turkish instruction. These teachers are usually native speakers of Turkish and have been trained in Germany to teach other subjects.²⁷ The fourth group comprises the so-called "consulate teachers" who are employees of the Turkish consulates and trained in Turkey. These teachers of Turkish usually teach in schools that cooperate with the Turkish consulate. As civil servants of the Turkish state, they are sent on a teaching assignment abroad for no longer than five years.

As the heritage language of the largest group of immigrants, the rationale behind Turkish instruction in Germany has developed along three different historical cycles (based on Thürmann 2003). Initially, Turkish heritage language instruction (back then "(additional) mother-tongue teaching" (*muttersprachlicher (Ergänzungs-) Unterricht*)) was based on the assumption that the children of the first immigrant workers would move back to Turkey one day. Participation was therefore clearly linked to Turkish citizenship and teaching objectives focused on preparing the pupils linguistically and culturally for reintegration. This "reintegration phase" was followed by the "integration phase" when parallel to the recruitment stop in 1973 the rationale behind

23 Cf. <https://www.uni-due.de/turkistik/>

24 Cf. www.aai.uni-hamburg.de/voror/BA-Tuerkisch.html for the BA level and www.aai.uni-hamburg.de/voror/MA-Tuerkisch.html for the MA level, both accessed 30.01.2015.

25 www.uni-tuebingen.de/de/31046, accessed 30.01.2015.

26 http://www.uni-muenchen.de/studium/studienangebot/studienfaecher/turkologie/lehramt_neu/la_gymn_/index.html, accessed 30.01.2015.

27 Only two federal states – NRW and Lower Saxony – have decided to test the language proficiency of prospective Turkish teachers.

heritage language teaching almost reversed: Integration into the receiving society and formal schools was now defined as the objective of heritage language instruction (cf. Thürmann 2003:164). This was based on the "resource argument" which is underpinned by the interdependence and threshold hypothesis put forward by Cummins (2000). According to this approach, developing competencies in Turkish would more easily facilitate both learning German as a second language and learning other subjects in German. In short, Turkish instruction was regarded in this phase as a support measure for both integration and identity development.

The phase we find ourselves in at present can be called the "resource phase": In the wake of intensified European integration and a rapidly emerging new global economy, the multilingual paradigm began to develop as a dominant rhetoric and gained momentum in the 1990s. Heritage languages were rhetorically recognized as an important feature of linguistic diversity in Europe and multilingualism began to be regarded as a resource in society. This rationale for the teaching of Turkish was therefore also linked to the pervasiveness of the language in Germany. Against the backdrop of rapidly evolving economic relations between Germany and Turkey, pupils were to be given the opportunity to develop the language as an extra qualification not only for schooling but also in the job market.

It is only in this present phase that instruction in Turkish as a subject open to other learners and not just to heritage speakers has gained momentum (mostly as a third foreign language). This is now a possible option at secondary level in a number of federal states such as NRW, Hamburg and Bremen.²⁸ In rare cases, elementary schools have also introduced a bilingual German-Turkish program either for the entire school population or as a stream (e.g. Lämmersieth Schule and Heinrich-Wolgast-Schule in Hamburg and Aziz Nesin-Schule in Berlin). The three schools cooperate with the relevant consulate which pays for the Turkish teachers. Turkish instruction at these schools is organized jointly for two different groups of pupils. One group consists of pupils whose dominant language on entering the program is German and the other group's dominant language is Turkish. Initially, literacy education begins in the respective dominant language and the groups are only taught together in less language-intensive subjects such as PE and art. The other language is perceived as the "partner language" and introduced through

28 According to the German Federal Statistical Office there was a total number of 12,807 pupils learning Turkish as a foreign language at secondary level in the 2012-2013 academic year (cf. Schmitz & Olfert 2013: 220 from Statistisches Bundesamt 2013: 104-107). How many of them are learners who do not use Turkish as a family language and can count as "real" foreign language learners is not traceable.

simultaneous intensive language instruction (cf. Niedrig 2001, Gogolin & Roth 2007). At least one other elementary school (Albert-Schweitzer Schule in Hanover) has introduced a bilingual Turkish-German program as a tool for school development and intercultural opening towards the neighbourhood in order to enhance mutual understanding, improve social cohesion and reduce white flight²⁹ (cf. Küppers & Yağmur 2014, Morris-Lange et al. 2013 and Barz et al. 2013). Language learning here is seen as a side effect of more important intercultural learning objectives. Turkish and non-Turkish speaking children are always taught together, both languages are part of literacy education in year one and English is introduced in year three.³⁰

Turkish heritage teaching has been facing a serious challenge since the turn of the millennium when the rationale underlying the "resource argument" (see above) was called into question. With the PISA results indicating that large numbers of pupils – mostly with a so-called migration background – were failing in the German education system due to a lack of proficiency in German, the general public as well as segments of the political and educational establishment called for more qualified German instruction. It became increasingly difficult to argue in favour of Turkish instruction for pupils who had failed in PISA due to poor German skills in terms of reading competencies. The overall sentiment in German society led to the emergence of extreme attitudes regarding the teaching of Turkish in Germany.³¹ Due to its complexity it has simply not been possible to present ultimate, clear-cut empirical proof defending the idea that institutional support of literacy development in the first language has a positive effect on development in the second language, although there is a lot of empirical evidence to support this.³² However, evidence also shows that this effect may not be taken for granted but is very much dependent on the quality and intensity of the Turkish

29 White flight is a term usually used for the phenomenon of middle-class families tending to remove their children from problem-ridden "hot spot" schools. However, the term's implications are misleading as not only middle-class families from the majority population avoid these schools but also middle-class families from other ethnic groups.

30 An ethnographic monitoring study is currently being carried out at this school and provides evidence of the effectiveness of this approach (cf. Küppers & Yağmur 2014). The final research report on the Hanover study will be published by Istanbul Policy Center in 2015.

31 For example, the sociologist Esser (2006) argued that Turkish had no return on investment in the job market for native speakers of the language. His position was further supported by scholars in educational science (e.g. Hopf 2005) as well as in empirical school research (e.g. Limbird & Stanat 2006, Dollman & Kristen 2010).

32 Some studies have documented transfer effects of Turkish heritage language teaching in specific linguistic fields such as reading skills (Rauch et al. 2012), text and comprehension strategies (Knapp 1997, Reich 2011) as well as writing skills (Verhoeven 1994).

language teaching (Reich 2011, Woerfel et al. 2014).³³ Against the backdrop of the persisting myth of "double semilingualism", the impact of heritage language teaching as an empowerment tool should also not be underestimated (cf. Cummins 1986, 2013; Fürstenau 2011): Turkish lessons can contribute to a more holistic self-perception on the part of the pupils. Positive effects at the level of teacher-pupil identity negotiations as well as power differences among children are notable in particular if Turkish is used in an integrated bilingual approach (cf. Küppers & Yağmur 2014, Cummins 2014). Turkish-speaking children develop more self-esteem and higher ambitions with regard to their own academic achievements when diversity is valued and Turkish is also used for concept learning and integrated into everyday classroom procedures. Moreover, monolingual German-speaking children are less likely to develop a feeling of superiority after experiencing the challenge of learning a difficult foreign language such as Turkish.

5. Discussion and outlook

Turkish is a vital and pervasive language in Germany, a minority language with a large number of speakers, possibly the largest of all languages apart from German spoken in everyday interaction in Germany. Its specific socio-linguistic history and situation in Germany has led to a high variability of speakers' registers and repertoires in which they draw from a continuum between monolingual modes in German and Turkish and different degrees of language mixing. What they draw from this continuum and how they draw from it arises, above all, from the social discourse contexts. This has consequences also for the development of the language itself; structural differences between the Turkish spoken in Turkey and that spoken in Germany clearly exist, but the degree of systematicity and stability of the 'new' Turkish dialect(s) spoken in Germany and Western Europe still remains to be explored.

In any case, the high degree of variability of speakers' registers and repertoires bears consequences for Turkish instruction in Germany, and where existent, the curricula for heritage language teaching are well aware of this.³⁴ The teaching of Turkish has to proceed with a high differentiation in class

33 In a longitudinal study, Reich (2011) shows the positive impact of a bilingual German-Turkish literacy program which was part of the school program and supported by the teachers. The study provides evidence for better results in German and Turkish compared to Turkish heritage language instruction which is not part of the school curriculum and does not work in a contrastive manner.

34 See, for example, Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung 2011a, b, c, Ministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Weiterbildung und Kultur Rheinland-Pfalz 2012.

(*Binnendifferenzierung*), and as far as the promotion of literacy in Turkish is concerned, there is a particular need for the development of a formal register and a "fine tuning" of available literate structures to the requirements of the individual text type in its social context. The available speaker knowledge must serve as a highly valued starting point here – however "wrong" it may be from the perspective of the Turkish prevailing in Turkey, it is what the speakers have experienced as functional in their social contexts and therefore to be considered "right". It goes without saying that tests developed to assess pupils' Turkish competence also need to adapt to these specific circumstances (Gagarina 2014).

However, speakers' variability is not the only challenge to Turkish instruction in Germany resulting from what we have discussed in this text. Teaching Turkish in Germany is deeply rooted in heritage language instruction and presently seems to be standing at a crossroads pointing in two different directions: 1) increasing marginalization of Turkish instruction due to its persistent image problem in society as the language of poor migrants and related mechanisms of ethnicization (Turkish belongs to "the Turks") and therefore continuously falling numbers of pupils; and 2) growing awareness of the added value of Turkish as a resource for individual and societal growth in a transmigration society such as Germany and consequently an upgrade of Turkish to a fully-fledged modern foreign language open to all pupils and integrated into the formal school curricula. This does not entail a renouncement of the "resource argument" for Turkish instruction; on the contrary, the resource argument is linked to the quality of the Turkish lesson and this in turn is linked to its status. In view of the rapidly evolving transnational space between Germany and Turkey, competencies in Turkish will / can also contribute to the development of transnational educational capital as a set of skills, attitudes and expertise based on linguistic and socio-cultural background knowledge of the two countries (cf. Küppers et al. 2015). This will not only help to enlarge cultural capital in Bordieu's sense but also contribute to the individual's ability to take agency in two different cultural settings, namely Germany and Turkey.

Eingang des revidierten Manuskripts 25.02.2015

References

- Aarsen, Jeroen; Backus, Ad & van der Heijden, Henneke (2006), Turkish in the Netherlands. In: Boeschoten, Hendrik & Johanson, Lars (eds.) (2006), *Turkic languages in contact*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 220-240.
- Androutopoulos, Jannis (2001), Ultra korregd Alder! Zur medialen Stilisierung und Popularisierung von 'Türkendeutsch'. *Deutsche Sprache* 4, 321-339.
- Backus, Ad (1996), *Two in one. Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands*. Dissertation. Tilburg University, Tilburg.
- Backus, Ad (2003), Can a mixed language be conventionalized – alternational codeswitching? In: Matras, Yaron & Bakker, Peter (eds.) (2003), *The mixed language debate. Theoretical and empirical advances*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 237-270.
- Backus, Ad (2005), Code switching and language change. One thing lead to the other? *International Journal of Bilingualism* 9:3-4, 307-340.
- Backus, Ad (2012), Turkish as an immigrant language in Europe. In: Bhatia, Tej K. & Ritchie, William C. (eds.) (2012), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*, 2nd ed., London: Blackwell, 770-790.
- Barz, Heiner; Cerci, Meral Cerci & Demir, Zeynep (2013), *Bildung, Milieu und Migration. Kurzfassung der Zwischenergebnisse*. Essen: Stiftung Mercator [Online: <http://stiftung-mercator.de/themencluster/integration/studie-bildung-milieu-migration.html>. 8.3. 2013].
- Bayram, Fatih (2013), *Acquisition of Turkish by heritage speakers: A processability approach*. PhD Dissertation. Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik (1990), *Acquisition of Turkish by immigrant children. A multiple case study of children in the Netherlands aged 4 to 6*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik (2000), Convergence and divergence in migrant Turkish. In: Mattheier, Klaus (ed.) (2000), *Dialect and migration in a changing Europe*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 145-154.
- Chlosta, Christoph & Ostermann, Torsten (2005), Warum fragt man nach der Herkunft, wenn man die Sprache meint? Ein Plädoyer für eine Aufnahme sprachbezogener Fragen in demographische Untersuchungen. In: Arbeitsstelle Interkulturelle Konflikte und gesellschaftliche Integration (ed.) (2005), *Bildungsdaten und Migrationshintergrund*. Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 62-74.
- Chlosta, Christoph; Ostermann, Torsten & Schroeder, Christoph (2003), Die „Durchschnittsschule“ und ihre Sprachen, Ergebnisse des Projekts Sprachenerhebung Essener Grundschulen (SPREEG), *ELiS_e* 1, 43-139 [Online: https://www.uni-due.de/imperia/md/content/elise/ausgabe_1_2003_spreeg.pdf. 30.1.2015].
- Cindark, Ibrahim & Aslan, Sema (2004), *Deutschlandtürkisch?* Mannheim: Open-Access Publikationsserver des IDS [Online: www1.ids-mannheim.de/fileadmin/prag/soziostilistik/Deutschlandtuerkisch.pdf. 30.1.2015].
- Cummins, Jim (1986), Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention. *Harvard Educational Review* 56: 1, 18-37.
- Cummins, Jim (2000), *Language, power and pedagogy. Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, Jim (2013), Immigrant Students' Academic Achievement: Understanding the Intersection between Research, Theory and Policy. In: Gogolin, Ingrid; Lange, Imke, Michel, Ute & Reich, Hans H. (Hrsg.) (2013), *Herausforderung Bildungssprache – und wie man sie meistert*. Münster: Waxmann, 19-41.

- Cummins, Jim (2014), Language and identity in multilingual schools: Constructing evidence-based instructional policies. In: Little, David; Leung, Constant & van Avermaet, Piet (eds.) (2014), *Managing diversity in education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 3-26.
- Decker, Yvonne & Schnitzer, Katja (2012), FreiSprachen – Eine flächendeckende Erhebung der Sprachenvielfalt an Freiburger Grundschulen. In: Ahrenholz, Berndt, Werner Knapp (Hrsg.) (2012), *Sprachstand erheben - Spracherwerb erforschen. Beiträge aus dem 6. Workshop „Kinder mit Migrationshintergrund“, 2010*. Stuttgart: Fillibach bei Klett, 95-112.
- Dirim, İnci (2009), „Ondan sonra gine schleifen yapiyorsunuz“: Migrationsspezifisches Türkisch in Schreibproben von Jugendlichen. In: Neuman, Ursula & Reich, Hans H. (Hrsg.) (2009), 129-146.
- Dirim, İnci & Auer, Peter (2004), *Türkisch sprechen nicht nur die Türken. Über die Unschärfebeziehung zwischen Sprache und Ethnie in Deutschland*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Doğruöz, A. Seda & Backus, Ad (2007), Postverbal elements in immigrant Turkish: Evidence of change? *International Journal of Bilingualism* 11: 2, 185-220.
- Doğruöz, A. Seda & Backus, Ad (2009), Innovative constructions in Dutch Turkish: An assessment of on-going contact-induced change. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 12: 1, 41-64.
- Dollmann, Jörg & Kristen, Cornelia (2010), Herkunftssprache als Ressource für den Schulerfolg? – Das Beispiel türkischer Grundschulkinde. In: Allemann-Ghionda, Cristina; Stanat, Petra; Göbel, Kerstin & Röhner, Charlotte (Hrsg.) (2010), *Migration, Identität, Sprache und Bildungserfolg*. Weinheim & Basel: Beltz, 123-146.
- Esser, Hartmut (2006), *Sprache und Integration. Die sozialen Bedingungen und Folgen des Spracherwerbs von Migranten*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- Foertsch, Patricia & Jessen, Frank (2007), Türkische Medien in Deutschland. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 1, 15-32.
- Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung (Hrsg.) (2011a), *Rahmenplan herkunftssprachlicher Unterricht Grundschule*. Hamburg [Online: <http://li.hamburg.de/contentblob/3850336/data/download-pdf-rp-herkunftsspr-unterricht-gs.pdf>. 30.1.2015].
- Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung (Hrsg.) (2011b), *Rahmenplan herkunftssprachlicher Unterricht Stadtteilschule*. Hamburg [Online: <http://li.hamburg.de/contentblob/3850338/data/download-pdf-rp-herkunftsspr-unterricht-sts.pdf>. 30.1.2015].
- Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung (Hrsg.) (2011c), *Rahmenplan herkunftssprachlicher Unterricht Gymnasium*. Hamburg [Online: <http://li.hamburg.de/contentblob/3850340/data/download-pdf-rp-herkunftsspr-unterricht-gym.pdf>. 30.1.2015].
- Fürstenau, Sara (2011), Schulischer Wandel durch Herkunftssprachenunterricht. In: Fürstenau, Sara & Gomolla Mechtild (Hrsg.) (2011), *Migration und schulischer Wandel: Mehrsprachigkeit*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 191-202.
- Fürstenau, Sara; Gogolin, Ingrid & Yağmur, Kutlay (Hrsg.) (2003), *Mehrsprachigkeit in Hamburg. Ergebnisse einer Sprachenerhebung an den Grundschulen in Hamburg*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Gagarina, Natalia (2014), Diagnostik von Erstsprachkompetenzen im Migrationskontext. In: Solveig, Chilla & Haberzettl, Stefanie (Hrsg.) (2014), *Mehrsprachigkeit. Reihe Handbuch Sprachentwicklung und Sprachentwicklungsstörungen, Bd. 4*. München: Elsevier, 73-84.

- Gogolin, Ingrid & Roth, Hans-Joachim (2007), Bilinguale Grundschule: Ein Beitrag zur Förderung der Mehrsprachigkeit. In: Anstatt, Tanja (Hrsg.) (2007), *Mehrsprachigkeit bei Kindern und Erwachsenen. Erwerb – Formen – Förderung*. Tübingen: Attempo, 31-46.
- Hinnenkamp, Volker (2005), Semilingualism, double monolingualism and blurred genres – on (not) speaking a legitimate language. *Migration. Journal of Social Science Education* 1 [Online: <http://www.jsse.org/index.php/jsse/article/viewFile/979/882>. 30.1.2015].
- Hopf, Dieter (2005), Zweisprachigkeit und Schulleistung bei Migrantenkindern. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 2, 236-251.
- Johanson, Lars (1991), Zur Sprachentwicklung der Turcia Germanica. In: Baldauf, Ingeborg; Kreiser, Klaus & Tezcan, Semih (Hrsg.) (1991), *Türkische Sprachen und Literaturen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 199-212.
- Jørgensen, J. Normann (ed.) (2008), Polylingual languaging around and among children and adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5: 3, 161-176.
- Keim, Inken (2007), *Die „türkischen Powergirls“. Lebenswelt und kommunikativer Stil einer Migrantinnengruppe in Mannheim*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Keim, Inken & Cindark, Ibrahim (2003), Deutsch-türkischer Mischcode in einer Migrantinnengruppe: Form von Jugendsprache oder soziolektales Charakteristikum? In: Neuland, Eva (Hrsg.) (2003), *Jugendsprache in Spiegel der Zeit*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang, 377-393.
- Knapp, Werner (1997), *Schriftliches Erzählen in der Zweitsprache*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Küppers, Almut; Schroeder, Christoph & Gülbeyaz, Esin Işıl (2014), *Languages in transition. Turkish in formal education in Germany. Analysis and perspectives*. Policy Brief. Istanbul: Istanbul Policy Center [Online: <http://ipc.sabanciuniv.edu/en/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/SEPTEMBER-2014-ALMUT-KUPPERS.pdf>. 30.1.2015].
- Küppers, Almut; Pusch, Barbara & Uyan-Semerci, Pinar (eds.) (2015), *Education in transnational spaces / Bildung in transnationalen Räumen*. Heidelberg: VS Springer Verlag (in print).
- Küppers, Almut & Yağmur, Kutlay (2014), *Why multilingual matters. Alternative change agents in language education policy*. IPC Focus-Report. Istanbul: Istanbul Policy Center [Online: http://ipc.sabanciuniv.edu/en/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/14580_IPMAlmutRaporWEB.07.07.14REV1.pdf. 30.1.2015].
- Limbird, Christina & Stanat, Petra (2006), Sprachförderung bei Schülerinnen und Schülern mit Migrationshintergrund: Ansätze und ihre Wirksamkeit. In: Baumert, Jürgen; Stanat, Petra & Watermann, Rainer (Hrsg.) (2006), *Herkunftsbedingte Disparitäten im Bildungswesen. Vertiefende Analysen im Rahmen von PISA 2000*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 257-307.
- Löser, Jessica & Woerfel, Till (erscheint 2015), Herkunftssprachenunterricht in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz. In: Ahrenholz, Bernt & Oomen-Welke, Ingelore (Hrsg.) (2015), *Deutsch als Zweitsprache*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider.
- Maas, Utz (2008), *Sprache und Sprachen in der Migrationsgesellschaft*. Göttingen: V&R unipress, Universitätsverlag Osnabrück.
- Maas, Utz (2010), Literat und orat. Grundbegriffe der Analyse geschriebener und gesprochener Sprache. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 73, 21-150.
- Menz, Astrid & Christoph Schroeder (erscheint 2015), Entwicklung des Lese- und Schreibenlernens in der Türkei. In: Röber, Christa (Hrsg.) (2015), *Schriftsprach- und Orthographieerwerb: Erstlesen, Erstschreiben*. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider.
- Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı, Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı (2000), Yurt dışındaki Türk çocukları için Türkçe dersi öğretim programı (1.-10. sınıflar) [Turkish educational program for the Turkish children living outside of Turkey (1st – 10th grades)]. Ankara.

- Ministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Weiterbildung und Kultur Rheinland-Pfalz (Hrsg.) (2012), *Rahmenlehrplan Herkunftssprachenunterricht*. Mainz [Online: http://migration.bildung-rp.de/fileadmin/_migrated/content_uploads/Rahmenlehrplan_Herkunftssprachenunterricht.pdf. 30.1.2015].
- Montrul, Silvina A. (2008), *Incomplete acquisition in bilingualism. Re-examining the age factor*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Morris-Lange, Simon; Wendt, Heike & Wohlfahrt, Charlotte (2013), *Segregation an deutschen Schulen. Ausmaß, Folgen und Handlungsempfehlungen für bessere Bildungschancen*. Berlin: Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration [Online: www.svr-migration.de/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/SVR-FB_Studie-Bildungssegregation_Web.pdf. 30.1.2015].
- Neumann, Ursula (2014), Türkçe Dersleri için Öğretmen Eğitimi Kaldırılmasın – Düzeltilsin! *PoliTeknik* 2, Juni/Juli 2014, 5.
- Niedrig, Heike (2001), Exkurs: Die staatliche Europa-Schule Berlin (SESB). In: Gogolin, Ingrid; Neumann, Ursula; Reuter, Lutz (Hrsg.) (2001), *Schulbildung für Kinder aus Minderheiten in Deutschland 1989-1999. Schulrecht, Schulorganisation, curriculare Fragen, sprachliche Bildung*. Münster: Waxmann, 77-80.
- Pfaff, Carol W. (1993), Turkish language development in Germany. In: Extra, Guus & Verhoeven, Ludo (eds.) (1993), *Immigrant languages in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 119-146.
- Pfaff, Carol. 2000. Development and use of et- and yap- by Turkish/German bilingual children. In: Göksel, Asli & Kerslake, Celia (eds.) (2000), *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 365-373.
- Polinsky, Maria (2006), Incomplete acquisition: American Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 14, 191-262.
- Queen, Robin M. (2001), Bilingual intonation patterns: Evidence of language change from Turkish-German bilingual children. *Language in Society* 30, 55-80.
- Queen, Robin. M. (2006), Phrase-final intonation in narratives told by Turkish-German bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 10: 2, 153-178.
- Rampton, Ben (1995), *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rauch, Dominique P.; Naumann, Johannes & Jude, Nina (2012), Metalinguistic awareness mediates effects of full biliteracy on third-language reading proficiency in Turkish-German bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 16: 4, 402-418.
- Rehbein, Jochen; Herkenrath, Annette & Karakoç, Birsal (2009), On contact-induced language change of Turkish as an immigrant language. *Language Typology and Universals* 62: 3, 171-204.
- Reich, Hans H. (2009), Entwicklungswege türkisch-deutscher Zweisprachigkeit. In: Neumann, Ursula & Reich, Hans H. (Hrsg.) (2009), *Erwerb des Türkischen in einsprachigen und mehrsprachigen Situationen*. Münster: Waxmann, 63-90.
- Reich, Hans & Hienz de Albenis, Milena (1998), Der Herkunftssprachenunterricht. Erläuterung und statistische Entwicklung in den alten Bundesländern. *Deutsch Lernen* 1, 3-45.
- Reich, Hans H. (2011), Sprachstark. Schriftsprachliche Fähigkeiten türkisch-deutscher Grundschülerinnen und Grundschüler in Köln. Ein Untersuchungsbericht, herausgegeben von der Bezirksregierung Köln. Stand: 12/2011. Köln: Bezirksregierung, Arbeitsstelle für Migranten [Online: http://www.gew-online.de/dms_extern/download.php?id=231754. 30.1.2015].

- Schmitz, Anke & Olfert, Helena (2013), Minderheitensprachen im deutschen Schulwesen. Eine Analyse der Implementierung allochthoner und autochthoner Sprachen. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung* 24: 2, 203-228.
- Schroeder, Christoph (2002), On the structure of spoken Turkish. *ELiS e 2*: 1, 73-90 [Online: www.uni-due.de/imperia/md/content/elise/ausgabe_1_2002_schroeder.pdf. 30.1.2015].
- Schroeder, Christoph (2003), Der Türkischunterricht und seine Sprache(n). *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung* 4: 1, 23-39.
- Schroeder, Christoph (2006), Hangi Türkçe? Anadili ve yabancı dil olarak Türkçe ve Batı Avrupa'da Türkçe eğitimi [Which Turkish? Turkish as a mother tongue and as a foreign language in Western Europe]. In: Menz, Astrid & Schroeder, Christoph (eds.) (2006), *Türkiye'de dil tartışmaları* [Language debates in Turkey] Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Publications, 209-228.
- Schroeder, Christoph (2007), Orthography in German-Turkish language contact. In: Baider, Fabienne (ed.) (2007), *Emprunts linguistiques, empreintes culturelles. Métissage orient-occident*, Paris: L'Harmattan, 101-122.
- Schroeder, Christoph (2014), Türkische Texte türkisch-deutscher Schülerinnen und Schüler in Deutschland. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 44: 174, 24-43.
- Schroeder, Christoph & Dollnick, Meral (2013), Mehrsprachige Gymnasiasten mit türkischem Hintergrund schreiben auf Türkisch. In: Riemer, Claudia; Brandl, Heike; Arslan, Emre & Langelahn, Elke (Hrsg.) (2013), *Mehrsprachig in Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft*. Open-Access-Publikation, BieColl – University of Bielefeld, 101-114 [Online: http://biecoll.uni-bielefeld.de/volltexte/2013/5274/index_de.html. 30.1.2015].
- Schroeder, Christoph & Şimşek, Yazgül (2010), Die Entwicklung der Kategorie Wort im Türkisch-Deutsch bilingualen Schrifterwerb in Deutschland. *IMIS-Beiträge* 37, 55-79.
- Selting, Margret & Kern, Friederike (2009), On some syntactic and prosodic structures of Turkish-German talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 2496-2514.
- Şimşek, Yazgül & Christoph Schroeder (2011), Migration und Sprache in Deutschland – am Beispiel der Migranten aus der Türkei und ihrer Kinder und Kindeskiner. In: Ozil, Şeyda; Hofmann, Michael & Dayıoğlu-Yücel, Yasemin (Hrsg.) (2011), *Fünfzig Jahre türkische Arbeitsmigration in Deutschland*. Göttingen: V & R unipress, 205-228.
- Şimşek, Yazgül (2012), Constructions with the Turkish *şey* and its German equivalent dings in Turkish-German-Conversations. In: Kern, Friederike & Selting, Margret (eds.) (2012), *Ethnic Styles of Speaking in European Metropolitan Areas*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 191-216.
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2013), *Bildung und Kultur. Allgemeinbildende Schulen. Fachserie 11, Reihe 1, 2012/2013*. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt [Online: https://www.destatistik.de/DE/Publikationen/Thematisch/BildungForschungKultur/Schulen/AllgemeinbildendeSchulen2110100147004.pdf;jsessionid=AC419D390C29F32AF50CB103FE54200D.cae3?__blob=publicationFile. 28.6.2014].
- Thürmann, Eike (2003), Herkunftssprachenunterricht. In: Bausch, Karl-Richard; Christ, Herbert & Krumm, Hans-Jürgen (Hrsg.) (2003), *Handbuch Fremdsprachenunterricht*, 4. Aufl., Tübingen: Francke, 163-168.
- Türker, Emel (2005), Resisting the grammatical change: Nominal groups in Turkish-Norwegian codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9: 3-4, 453-476.
- Verhoeven, Ludo (1994), Transfer in bilingual development: The linguistic interdependence hypothesis revisited. *Language Learning* 44: 3, 381-415.

- Wiese, Heike (2010), Führt Mehrsprachigkeit zum Sprachverfall? Populäre Mythen vom 'gebrochenen Deutsch' bis zur 'doppelten Halbsprachigkeit' türkischstämmiger Jugendlicher in Deutschland. In: Ozil, Şeyda; Hofmann, Michael & Dayıoğlu-Yücel, Yasemin (Hrsg.) (2010), *Türkisch-deutscher Kulturkontakt und Kulturtransfer*. Göttingen: V & R unipress, 73-84.
- Wiese, Heike (2013), Das Potenzial multiethnischer Sprechergemeinschaften. In: Deppermann, Arnulf (Hrsg.) (2013), *Das Deutsch der Migranten*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 41-58.
- Woerfel, Till; Koch, Nikolas; Yılmaz Woerfel, Seda & Riehl, Claudia (2014), Mehrsprachigkeit bei mehrsprachig aufwachsenden Kindern: Wechselwirkungen und außersprachliche Einflüsse. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 174, 44-65.