SYNTACTIC CHANGE IN AN IMMIGRANT LANGUAGE: FROM NON-FINITE TO FINITE SUBORDINATE CLAUSES IN TURKISH

Pelin Onar Valk and Ad Backus
Tilburg University

Abstract. While Turkish immigrants in Western Europe orient themselves to the norms of Standard Turkish, their Turkish is constantly being influenced by the European language they also speak. As a result of language contact, slowly but surely, new varieties of Turkish seem to be evolving, exhibiting loss of certain features and/or borrowing of words and structures taken from European languages. In this article, the focus is on Immigrant Turkish in the Netherlands, particularly on how it forms subordinate clauses. We compare data from the Netherlands and Turkey, with the data coming from two sources: spontaneous conversation and a sentence recall task. The main finding that both data sources converge on is that Dutch Turkish speakers clearly prefer to use finite subordinate clauses, especially in reported speech structures, and that this is a clear influence from Dutch. In Turkey, subordination is predominantly non-finite. The findings are interpreted in a usage-based perspective on contact-induced change.

1. Introduction

Contact linguistics is often about language change, specifically about change induced by contact (Thomason 2001, Winford 2003, Heine and Kuteva 2005, Myers-Scotton 2006, Matras 2009). This is a natural focus, given that one of the main effects of language contact is that the languages involved influence each other, though usually only in one direction. Often, one of the languages is socially subordinate, and as a result it borrows material from the other language. The borrowed material can be anything, from phonological properties to discourse styles, but what is most familiar, and perhaps most frequent, is lexical and structural borrowing. Lexical borrowing shows up as loanwords and as changes in the way native words are used on the basis of how their equivalents in the other language are used. This leads to semantic extensions and loan translations. Structural borro-

wing, on the other hand, refers to changes in the syntax of the borrowing language, as it takes over structural properties of the other language. This paper is about structural borrowing, or replication (Heine and Kuteva 2005, Backus, Doğruöz, and Heine 2011) in the domain of subordinate clauses.

While lexical change is relatively easy to demonstrate, since the new word or the new usage of a familiar word didn't exist before the language contact situation got underway, it is notoriously hard to prove that a structural property was borrowed from the other language. The reason is that it is rarely the case that the structure that is claimed to be new is really new in the sense that it didn't exist in the language before contact. This has led some to claim that languages don't borrow structural features at all (e.g. Silva-Corvalán 2008). Unfortunately, arguments in favor of and against this position are hard to evaluate because they are generally made from within particular theoretical positions about what counts as syntax, and about what counts as change. There are two extreme positions. One, associated with formal syntactic theories, claims that most alleged contact-induced structural changes are really changes in preference: a particular structure is just used more often by bilinguals, and frequency of use is not a syntactic characteristic. Let's say a language changes its basic word order from SOV to SVO, but SVO was already grammatical before contact; this is then analyzed as a change in preference in which SVO becomes the more unmarked order. Perhaps a further change in pragmatic meaning is associated with the change, as the pragmatic impact that SVO had will be weakened as the order becomes the more unmarked one.

The other extreme is the view, associated with usage-based linguistics, that a change in frequency of use is also structural change, because frequency of use is claimed to affect mental representation (e.g. Doğruöz and Backus 2009). If a speaker shifts from predominantly using SVO to predominant SOV use, he/she exhibits structural change, and if many other speakers of the same language undergo the same process, there is evidence for contact-induced language change. As long as it's purely frequency that is involved, probably not much hinges on this debate, but if pragmatics plays a role, too, things become more intricate. In the usage-based approach, pragmatics counts as meaning, and hence structures are not just forms: they have meaning, too, just like a lexical item. If the *word order* changes its pragmatic impact from marked to unmarked, it is qualitatively similar to when a *word* changes its meaning on the basis of its foreign equivalent: in both cases we have an instance of contact-induced semantic extension. We will adopt this approach in our paper.

A complicating factor is that it is sometimes not so clear whether we are dealing with a lexical or structural change, or whether the difference can even be maintained. The difference is clear as long as we look at prototypical cases, such as loanwords (lexical) and word order (structural). The difference between Matter loans (overt lexical material) and Pattern loans (structural 'covert' material; cf. Matras and Sakel 2007) is a related difference. However, what to do with borrowed function words such as prepositions? Or with the changed usage of a native adposition on the basis of the way its equivalent in the other language is used? For usage-based approaches, these cases are especially interesting because the difference between syntax and lexicon is criticized on theoretical grounds anyway.

One way in which the discussion can be elevated to a more secure footing is by striving for methodological pluralism. Contact studies are generally based on just one type of data, usually the analysis of a relatively small corpus of naturally produced speech by a few representative speakers. This sometimes casts doubt on the degree to which the findings can be generalized to the larger community. In this paper, we will present the results of an attempt to widen the methodological basis, by combining such conversational data with the results of an experimental task in which a larger group of participants had to produce language that contained some of the critical structures we were interested in for this particular study. The idea behind this methodological step was that if we would find converging evidence, i.e. presence or absence of signs of the same change in both types of data, the evidence for or against change would be stronger.

In this study, we focus on subordination in the Turkish spoken by the large Turkish immigrant community in the Netherlands. This community came into being through labor migration in the 1960's; by now a third generation is growing up. Most members of the community are bilingual, and use both languages on an everyday basis (cf. Backus forthc. for a general survey of linguistic and sociolinguistic work done on this community). Subordination is a fruitful domain for our goals for several reasons. First, it is solidly syntactic. That is, it avoids to an extent the discussion about whether or not any changes we might uncover are lexical or structural. Second, there have been other studies, in other multilingual contexts, that have shown this to be a domain that is vulnerable to contact effects (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2005). Some of these studies have been on Turkish immigrant varieties, especially in Germany (e.g. Rehbein et al. 2009), and have shown enough indications that we may expect to find some degree of change in our data. Other Turkic languages have been influenced for a long time by Slavic languages (especially Gagauz, Karaim and Macedonian

Turkish, e.g. Friedman 2003). Finally, Turkish and Dutch differ considerably in how they form subordinate clauses, so potentially we should be able to find relatively clear evidence for whether or not Dutch has influenced Turkish in how it forms such clauses.

The rest of this paper is built up as follows. The next section introduces the subordination structures of Turkish and Dutch, focusing on the similarities and differences. Sections 3 and 4 present the results of our study, first for conversational data and then for the sentence recall experiment we carried out. The methodological details will be provided in those sections. This is followed by a concluding section that comes back to the points raised above.

2.   Subordination and contact-induced change

Our research question is whether or not we find evidence for contact-induced change in the domain of subordination in our data from Dutch Turkish, which we will refer to as 'NL-Turkish'. To do this, we will compare NL-Turkish data with Turkish as spoken in Turkey ('TR-Turkish'). If the answer to the question is 'yes', as we expect, the next question is which particular constructions are affected. We used two kinds of data: spontaneous group conversation and a sentence recall task. The methods and results will be discussed in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. This section will introduce the characteristics of subordination and that of its most frequently used sub-type, reported speech, in Turkish and Dutch. We will see that the two languages differ considerably in this syntactic domain, which will help us in identifying whether or not we can talk of contact-induced change if we find a difference between NL- and TR-Turkish.

2.1.   Subordinate clauses

Turkish and Dutch display different types of subordination. Most importantly, Turkish has both finite and non-finite subordinate clauses while Dutch only has the finite option, at least for the specific structures under investigation here.

2.1.1. Subordination in Turkish

Though the typological and grammatical literature presents Turkish as spoken in Turkey, to a large extent, as a language exhibiting nominalized, i.e. non-finite, subordinate clauses (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 135, Kornfilt 1997: 45, 54), it is in fact possible to use both

finite and non-finite subordinating constructions. The same meaning can often be conveyed by using either type, though as far as we know there are no studies that have investigated the distribution of these types in the everyday spoken discourse, nor in different dialects.

Finite subordination means that the predicate of the subordinate clause bears finite inflection, just like in a main clause. Finite subordinate clauses can be juxtaposed to the main clauses or linked to it with the use of a subordinator, like *diye* and *ki* in the following constructed examples (as the glosses indicate, *diye* is originally a quotative, and *ki* is the closest equivalent in Turkish to the basic complementizer 'that'):

(1) [Bugün okul-a   gel-ecek-sin] **diye**   düşün-üyor-du-k.
      today   school-DAT come-FUT-2.SG   saying   think-PROG-PST-1PL
      "We thought that you would come to school today."

(2) Gör-üyor-um   **ki** [bugün ders   **çalış-mı-yor-sun**].
      see-PROG-1sg   that today   lesson   study-NEG-Prog-2SG
      "I see that you are not studying today."

Verbs of belief often have finite subordinate clauses preceding the main verb, as in the following examples:

(3) Selin [sen dün   sinema-ya **git-ti-n**]   san-ıyor.
      Selin   you yesterday cinema-DAT go-PST-2SG believe-PROG.3SG.
      "Selin believes that you went to the cinema yesterday."

(4) [Bugün ev-e   kaç-ta   **gel-ir**]
      today house-DAT what.time-LOC   come-PRS.3SG
      bil-mi-yor-um**.**
      know-NEG-PROG-1SG
      "I don't know what time he comes home today."

Use of the subordinators *ki*, *diye*, etc. also enables the possibility of having finite adverbial clauses, which has, however, a very limited use (Kornfilt 1997: 46). The result, exemplified in the following example, looks structurally quite similar to the type of adverbial clause common in many European languages:

(5) Çok çalış-mış   **ki**   bütün sınav-lar-ı   geç-miş.
      very study-PST.3SG **that** all   exam-PL-ACC   pass-PST.3SG
      "She studied a lot so that she passed all the exams."

Finally, *coordinated* finite clauses are common, with or without conjunctions. This is not subordination, of course, but arguably it does help entrench the template for finite structures used in complex clauses. Finite coordinating clauses are either juxtaposed, as in the first example below, or linked by a conjunction or connective, such as *ve* 'and' in the second example:

(6) Müdür   bir   zarf-la   ofis-im-e
     manager one   envelope-COM   office-POSS.1SG-DAT
     ge-ldi,   zarf-ı   bana   **ver-di**,   kapıyı
     come-PST.3SG envelop-ACC me-DAT **give-PST.3SG** door-ACC

     kapat-tı,   kendi   ofis-i-ne   **git-ti**.
     close-PST.3SG his.own office-POSS.3SG-DAT **go-PST.3SG**
     "The manager came to my office with an envelope in his hand, gave it
     to me, closed the door and went to his own office."

(7) Yarın   pazar-a   gid-eceğ-im **ve** 2 kilo   balık
     tomorrow   market-DAT   go-FUT-1SG and 2 kilos fish
     al-acağ-ım.
     buy-FUT-1SG
     "I will go to the market tomorrow and buy 2 kilos of fish.

In **non-finite** subordination, a subordinate clause contains a non-finite verbal predicate; in Turkish this means it is marked with one of the many subordination markers that form nominalizations or converbs. As mentioned before with reference to the grammars by Kornfilt and Göksel and Kerslake, Turkish has predominantly non-finite subordination, despite the existence of the finite options outlined above. However, as far as we are aware there has not been a thorough examination of this claim for spoken Turkish.

Non-finite structures are found in all three types of subordinate clauses: *complement*, *relative* and *adverbial* clauses. Complement or noun clauses function as subjects or objects of the main clause. Kornfilt (1997: 45) states that the most prominent subordinators are the three nominalization markers that are attached to verbal stems. There are two 'factive' nominalization suffixes, non-future *–DIK*[1] and future *–AcAK*, exemplified in the first example below, where they form otherwise identical object clauses, and an 'action nominalization', the 'short infinitive marker' *–mA* exemplified in the second example, where it forms a subject clause. As the first example also illustrates,

---

1   The capitals in morpheme indicators stand for the vowels and consonants that change due to
     the vowel and consonant harmony rules of Turkish.

the whole subordinate clause is marked with a case marker if it functions as the direct object.

(8) [Melis-in   Ankara'ya   gel-**diğ**-i-ni / gel-**eceğ**-i-ni] duy-du-m.
                                       (Factive nominal as obj. clause)
     Melis-GEN Ankara-DAT   come-F.NMLZ-3SG-ACC   hear-PST-1SG
     "I heard that Melis came/will come to Ankara."

(9) [Melis-in   eve   geç   gel-**me**-si]
     Melis-GEN   home-DAT   late   come-A.NMLZ-POSS.3SG
     anne-si-ni   kızdır-dı.
                                       (Action nominal as subj.clause)
     mother-POSS.3SG-ACC   make.angry-PST.3SG
     "That Melis came home late made her mother angry."

Relative or adjectival clauses function as adjectival noun modifiers, and, like simple adjectives, are positioned before the noun. The most prevalent type of relative clause in Turkish is non-finite, using one of the participial suffixes *–(y)An* (for subject relatives), *–DIK* or *–(y)AcAK* (the latter two for object or oblique relatives, often corresponding to the English relative pronouns 'who', 'which', 'that', 'whom', 'whose', 'where', etc.), and is followed by agreement morphology in the case of non-subject relatives. Finite relative clauses with the *ki* subordinator may also occur (as in the third example below), but are very rare (Kornfilt 1997: 65).

(10) [Şu konuş-**an**   adam] sen-i   beğen-iyor
     that talk-REL.SUBJ man   you-ACC   like-PROG.3SG
     "That man who is talking likes you."

(11) [Dün   seyret-**tiğ**-im   film-]i   beğen-me-di-m.
     yesterday   watch-NMLZ-1sg.   film-ACC   like-NEG-PST-1SG
     "I did not like the movie I watched yesterday."

(12) Öyle bir adam-la   tanış-tı-m   **ki** akşam   onun-la
     Such a   man-COM meet-Past-1SG **ki** tonight   him-COM
     yemeğ-e   gid-iyor-um.
     dinner-DAT   go-PROG-1SG
     "I met this guy with whom I am going out for dinner tonight."

Adverbial clauses, finally, are also mostly non-finite in Turkish. Just like the other non-finite clauses, they are characterized by subordinating suffixes attached to the verb, which can be followed by a

postposition, case marker or noun phrase that further specifies its meaning. A sub-class consists of converbs, which are marked by special suffixes directly attached to the subordinate verb stem. They often correspond to English 'when' or 'while'. The converbial suffixes –*ArAk*, –*IncA*, and –*rken* are illustrated in the following examples.

(13) [Ev-e   **gid-er-ken**]   tatlı   al-dı-m.
      house-DAT   go-PRS-while dessert buy-PST-1SG
      "I bought dessert while (I was) going home."

(14) [Ev-e   **gid-ince**]   sen-i   ara-yacağ-ım.
      house-DAT   go-when   you-ACC   call-FUT-1SG
      "I will call you when I go home."

(15) Sınav-ı   [çok   **çalış-arak**]   geç-ti.
      exam-ACC   much   study-manner   pass-PST.3SG
      "Study**ing** hard, s/he passed the exam."

Adverbial subordination takes a wide variety of subordinating suffixes, as there are many semantic nuances of time, manner, purpose, result, cause, condition, degree, place and concession that they are used to express. Below are a few examples, which illustrate that the morphosyntactic templates are varied. Note that the first example combines the factive nominalization marker –*DIK* with the locative case marker, to yield 'when' ('at the time of coming home').

(16) Ben   akşam   ev-e   gel-**diğ-im-de**   Pelin
      I   evening home-DAT   come-**NMLZ-Poss.1SG-LOC** Pelin
      uyu-yor-du.   (*time* adverbial)
      sleep-PROG-PST.3SG
      "**When** I came home in the evening, Pelin was sleeping."

(17) Dün   Pelin ev-e   ağla-**ya** ağla-**ya**   gel-di.
                                                            (*manner* adverbial)
      yesterday Pelin home-DAT   cry-CVB cry-CVB   come-PST.3SG
      "Pelin came home **crying** yesterday".

(18) Aile-m-i   gör-**mek için** İzmir'e   gid-iyor-um.
                                                            (*purpose* adverbial)
      family-POSS.1SG-ACC see-INF   for İzmir-DAT   go-PROG-1SG
      "I am going to İzmir **to see my family**."

2.1.2. Subordination in Dutch

Dutch only uses finite subordinate clauses in the structures that correspond to the complement, relative, and adverbial clauses discussed above for Turkish. Dutch subordinate clauses are connected to the main clause with subordinators or conjunctions such as *dat* 'that', *omdat* 'because', etc. Some constructed examples of finite subordinate clauses are given below. The final example shows that coordinated clauses are also finite.

(19) Ik   denk   [**dat** mijn moeder   een lekker   broodje
      I   think.1SG   that my   mother   a   delicious roll
      heeft   **gebakken**].   (*Complement clause*)
      have-PRS.3SG   bake-PST.PTCP
      "I think that my mother baked a delicious roll."

(20) Ik kom   niet   met jullie   mee   naar Brussel
      I   come.PRS.1SG   NEG with you.2PL along to   Brussels
      [**omdat** ik **moet**   **werk-en**].   (*Adverbial clause*)
      because I   have to.PRS.1SG   work-INF
      "I am not coming with you to Brussels because **I have to work**"

(21) [De   man **die** ik gisteren   in de   kantine
      the   man who   I   yesterday in the   canteen
      zag]   belde   me   vandaag.   (*Relative clause*)
      see.PST.1SG   phone.PST.1sg me   today
      "The man who I saw in the canteen yesterday phoned me today."

(22) **Gaan**   jullie   naar   de   bioscoop **of**   **kijken**
      go-PRS.2PL you.PL to   the   cinema   or   watch-PRS.2PL
      jullie   thuis   naar   een   filmpje?   (*Conjuctions*)
      you.PL at.home to   an   movie
      "Are you going to the cinema or are you watching a movie at home?"

2.2.   Reported Speech structures

Reported Speech (RS) is a subcategory of subordination. We decided to pay special attention to it because it is very frequent in our data, and also our initial look at the instantiations suggested some interesting developments. Our analysis confirmed this, as we will show in Section 4. RS constructions in Turkish and Dutch differ, but not in the same way as the cases of subordination discussed in the previous sub-section. Most importantly, Turkish makes use of *finite*

subordination for *direct RS* and non-finite subordination for *indirect RS* (Kornfilt 1997: 3). Dutch, once more, only has finite options for both types.

2.2.1. Reported Speech in Turkish

Like subordination in general, RS can be expressed through non-finite and finite constructions in Turkish. Indirect RS is conveyed by non-finite subordination, with subordinating suffixes on the predicate of the subordinate clause. The matrix verb is generally one of the following: *söyle-* 'say', *anlat-* 'tell', *haber ver-* or *bildir-* 'notify', etc.

(23) Selin [ban-a   dün   sinema-ya   **git-tiğ-i-ni**]
     Selin I-DAT   yesterday cinema-DAT go-NMLZ-POSS.3SG-ACC
     söyle-di
     say-PST.3SG
     "Selin told me that she went to the cinema yesterday."

As seen in this example, the embedded clause expresses indirect speech, and that it is nominal is shown by its possessive agreement marker and by it being marked with accusative case, as the embedded clause functions as the direct object in the main clause.

Direct speech, on the other hand, is expressed through finite subordination: the quoted speech is presented as a full clause, including a verb marked for tense, aspect and person, as needed. Direct speech can also be marked with the subordinators *ki* and *diye* (recall that the latter is originally a quotative), while the matrix verb is generally *de-* 'say'. When used to introduce RS, *ki* causes the main verb to precede the RS as in the second example below. The last example illustrates an unconventional finite structure for indirect speech that nevertheless sometimes occurs (note that the quote is in the third person).

(24) Selin "Yarın   Ankara'ya   gid-iyor-um"   de-di.
     Selin tomorrow Ankara-DAT   go-PROG-1SG   say-PST.3SG
     "Selin said "I am going to Ankara tomorrow" "

(25) Sen biz-e   de-din   **ki** "bu hafta   tatil-e   gid-eceğ-iz".
     You we-DAT   say-PST.2SG ki this week   holiday   go-FUT-1PL
     "You said to us: "we are going on holiday this week"

(26) (?) Cem biz-e   de-di   **ki**   [bu hafta   tatil-e
     Cem we-DAT   say-PST.3SG   ki   this week   holiday
     çık-acak-mış].

go-FUT-EVID.PST.3SG
"Cem said that he would go on holiday this week."

2.2.2. Reported Speech in Dutch

In Dutch, both direct and indirect reported speech are encoded through finite subordination, as in the following examples:

(27) Hij zegt "Ik werk 20 uur per week"   (*Direct speech*)
       "He says 'I work 20 hours per week' "

(28) Hij zei **dat** hij 20 uur per week heeft gewerkt.   (*Indirect Speech*)
       "He said that he worked 20 hours per week."

3.   Study 1: Spontaneous group conversations

As mentioned in the introduction, in the interest of finding converging evidence we conducted two types of study to find answers to the same research question, approaching it from different perspectives. Language contact studies generally don't do this, relying mostly on recordings of spontaneous conversation. We used recordings as well, but added a sentence recall task. The conversational data can be said to deal with language production; the recall task with processing. This section will present the data that came out of the recordings; Section 4 deals with the experimental data. Both sections will start with a methodology sub-section before the results are presented.

3.1.   Conversational data: methodology

Our first study followed the familiar methodology from contact linguistic research, and consisted of the analysis of a small corpus of recorded conversation. The goal was to record speech that was as close as possible to everyday conversation in the immigrant community, since that is the register in which contact linguistics is primarily concerned.

Therefore, the conversations were collected through the help of a Turkish-Dutch bilingual research assistant who was hired for the data collection. She was also an intermediate for us in reaching suitable participants (see below). The assistant was trained on how to collect the data and also made aware of the goals of our research. She made use of her circle of friends, family members and classmates, since they trust her and would not object to being recorded. Above all, this way a

natural and authentic atmosphere could be created. In addition, familiar settings were chosen for the gatherings, such as a school cafe, the family dining room, and friends visiting each other. As a result, we obtained conversational data in a heavily bilingual mode, containing a lot of code-switching. Six different bilingual group conversations of different lengths (13, 17, 28, 37, 40 and 44 minutes) were recorded. However, the 17-minute conversation was excluded from the current analysis as it ended up being in monolingual Dutch. Our data base, therefore, contains five spontaneous group conversations.

The informants were 14 Turkish – Dutch bilingual adults in the age range of 18 to 35. They all grew up in the Netherlands, and have Turkish ethnic backgrounds. The assistant gave them the following reason for why their conversation was being recorded: "The purpose is not to test your language skills. They are just interested in how we talk and how we mix the two languages in our daily lives". All the participants agreed on being recorded. The researchers were not present during the group conversations. Listening to the conversations, one gets the impression that, perhaps thanks to the fact that the participants were so close to each other, they more or less forgot about the presence of the recorder once they started talking.

3.2.   Conversational data: results

At the most basic level, the results of Study 1 do not confirm the clear preference for non-finite subordination that the literature on Turkish syntax would lead us to expect (cf. Section 2). Table 1 shows that there are almost as many finite as non-finite subordinate clauses in the data.

Table 1. Distribution of subordination

Subordination	
Non-finite	Finite
350	334

This suggests that Dutch Turkish uses an abundance of finite subordination in many places where non-finite would also have been possible. Either they prefer using the finite option in many cases, or they tend to avoid using the non-finite option.

The following are some examples from the data where a finite option was selected; the non-finite option that, allegedly, would be the preferred option in TR-Turkish is given as well:

(29) [Ja hangi *vak*-lar-ı   **al-acak-sınız**]   bil-iyor
Yes which   specialization-PL-ACC   take-FUT-2PL   know-PROG
mu-sun?
Q-2SG
"Yes, do you know which *specialization*s you will choose?"

non-finite: Ja [hangi *vak*-lar-ı **al-acağ-ınız-ı**] biliyor mu-sun?
                                 take-NMLZ-2PL-ACC

(30) Bak, duy-du-n   mu   [anne-n   ne   de-di]?
Look hear-PST-2SG Q.3SG   mother-POSS.2SG what   say-PST.3SG
"Look, did you hear what your mother said?"

non-finite: Bak, [anne-n-in ne de-diğ-i-ni] duydun mu?
                       mother-POSS.2SG-GEN what say-NMLZ-POSS.2SG- ACC

(31) Bak-mış-lar   *administratie*'de   [ne kadar   **ver-ebil-ir-ler**].
look-PST-3PL administration-LOC   how much   give-can-PRS-3PL
"They looked in the register (to see) how much they can give.

non-finite: *Administratie*'de [ne kadar **ver-ebil-*ecek*-ler-i-ne**] bak-mış-lar**.
              [how much give-can-NMLZ-3PL-POSS.3SG-DAT]

The second remarkable finding is that no instance at all was encountered of non-finite indirect Reported Speech, cf. Table 2. Recall from Section 2 that Turkish has both finite and non-finite RS constructions and that indirect RS only makes use of the non-finite option. The participants clearly showed a preference for direct RS which is virtually always constructed with finite subordination.

Table 2. Reported Speech distribution

Reported speech		
Non-finite	Finite	
	Direct finite	Indirect finite
0	133	1

Considering that non-finite subordination is more common in Standard Turkish, there appears to be a very significant difference between reported speech in NL-Turkish and in TR-Turkish: the Dutch Turkish data show an overwhelming preference for the structure that resembles Dutch grammar more, with a high amount of finite direct RS.

The first example below is a case where finite direct speech is used in NL-Turkish, but where the non-finite indirect option would be the preference for TR-Turkish. The second example is the only occurrence of indirect finite reported speech in the sample.

(32) Ban-a   de-di   "hamile-yim".
     I-DAT   say-PST.3SG   pregnant-PRS.1SG
     "She said to me "I am pregnant" ".

     non-finite: Bana **[hamile ol-*duğ*-u-nu]** söyle-di.
                         [pregnant be-*NMLZ*-POSS.3SG-ACC]

(33) ... şey de-di   ban-a   [çocuk-lar-ı-nı   okul-dan
     stuff   say-PST.3SG   I-DAT   [child-PL-POSS-ACC   school-ABL
     al-mak.   isti-yor-muş]
     take-INF   want-PROG-EVID.PST]
     "She said to me: "she wanted to take her children away from that school.""

4. Study 2: Sentence repetition task (or elicited imitation)

The previous section noted two major findings that came out of the analysis of the bilingual group conversations: a) extensive use of finite and/or avoidance of non-finite subordination in immigrant Turkish; and b) Dutch-style reported speech structures.

In Section 1, it was pointed out that spontaneous speech can show what occurs, but not whether what does not occur is impossible, i.e. whether it is absent from the speakers' mental representations. If we don't encounter much non-finite subordination in usage, it does not automatically mean that the bilinguals do not have it at all in their competence (Gullberg et al. 2009). By means of a sentence recall task, we aimed to find out to what degree the findings from Study 1 could be replicated. Using actual instances of finite subordination from the conversations in the task, we intended to see if the participants would convert any finite into non-finite subordination when asked to repeat the sentences. We also constructed non-finite subordinate clauses to see whether these would be repeated as non-finite; priming of the construction could be expected to trigger them, lowering the effect of contact with Dutch.

4.1.   Experimental data: methodology

Though the task was based on what is called a *sentence recall* or *repetition* task (Gullberg et al. 2009: 34–35), this may not be the most accurate name for it. Test items are actually successions of sentences, usually three or four. The idea was to make imitation relatively difficult to do, and prevent the participants from just parroting the sentences. They were supposed to listen to the short connected sequence and then recall it. We assumed this would induce them to consult their grammatical knowledge in creating their sentences while recalling. For that reason, the task is perhaps better labeled an *elicited imitation task* (Gullberg et al. 2009: 34).

The test items were taken from the spontaneous group conversations (Study 1) as much as possible, though we had to construct some of the sentences with non-finite subordination. The finite subordinate sentences were extracted from bilingual conversations, and thus contained code-switching. We mostly chose sentences which could easily have been used in their non-finite form, but were consistently and frequently produced as finite in the conversational data. The initial battery of test items was worked on by the first author and four bilingual research assistants, and this resulted in some of the sequences of sentences being shortened.

Two groups of participants carried out the task. The first group consisted of 20 Turkish-Dutch bilingual participants with the same type of profile as the Study 1 participants (age range 18–30, raised and educated in the Netherlands). The sessions were led by the main bilingual research assistant under the first author's supervision. Second, a control group of ten monolinguals in Turkey was tested with the same items, except that all items were completely in Turkish. The task was conducted by the first author, a native speaker of TR-Turkish.

The participants were allowed to hear the items a maximum of three times if they had difficulties remembering. They received the following instruction: "you are expected to reflect the message back, sort of like a repetition, but you don't have to parrot it. You can use your own words and you can repeat it in the way you like. You can make changes in parts that do not sound nice or good to you."

In total, the participants were presented with 34 finite and 44 non-finite clause combinations to repeat and the task lasted around an hour per participant. All responses were recorded and transcribed with the help of the four bilingual assistants.

4.2.   Experimental data: findings

We will report on the findings for the two aspects of subordination that seemed to be undergoing change, judging by the conversational data: a) extensive use of finite and/or avoidance of non-finite subordination; and b) Dutch-style reported speech structures.

4.2.1. Subordination

In each of the tables below, the numbers following the group name ('bilinguals' or 'monolinguals') indicate the numbers of actual and possible repetitions, based on the numbers of subjects and test items. Table 3, therefore, shows that there could have been 1560 possible repetitions in the data of the bilinguals, considering there were 20 participants and 78 test items. However, only 1419 repetitions were obtained as participants sometimes missed or forgot the critical parts of the items.

Table 3 gives a general total overview of the rate of subordination usage with both finite and non-finite subordination stimuli, for Turkish-Dutch bilinguals in the Netherlands and Turkish monolinguals in Turkey. Overall, 73% of the responses of the monolinguals and 52% of those of the bilinguals were non-finite. Prevalence of non-finite subordination is only clearly visible in the TR-Turkish data. A chi-square test gave significant differences between the two groups of participants (p < .001). This suggests that the differences between NL-Turkish and TR-Turkish subordination uncovered in Study 1 were confirmed.

Table 3. Subordination total (finite + non-finite stimuli)

Bilinguals (1419 / 1560 pos.rep.)		Monolinguals (692 / 780 pos.rep.)	
Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
48%	52%	27%	73%

Tables 4 and 5 separate the results per type of stimulus. As Table 4 shows, when monolingual participants were presented with finite subordination in the stimulus item, they changed it to a non-finite form in 46% of the cases, while this happened in only 19% of the cases with bilinguals. In other words, bilinguals overwhelmingly preserved the finite construction (81%), while monolinguals only did so in slightly more than half of the cases (54%). The chi-square test results give us significant differences between bi- and monolinguals; p < .001.

Table 4. Subordination with finite stimuli

Bilinguals (638 / 680)		Monolinguals (303 / 340)	
Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
81%	19%	54%	46%

Table 5 shows what happened when the subjects were given non-finite stimuli to repeat. In only 5% of the cases did monolinguals turn non-finite subordinate items into finite forms, whereas bilinguals did this in 21% of the cases, and the groups' repetition patterns differed significantly from each other (chi-square test: $p < .001$).

Table 5. Subordination with non-finite stimuli

Bilinguals (781 / 880)		Monolinguals (389 / 440)	
Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
21%	79%	5%	95%

We can conclude that finite subordination is more prevalent in NL-Turkish than in TR-Turkish. The claim that Turkish subordination is predominantly non-finite has been confirmed for our TR-Turkish participants, but the subordination constructions of the bilinguals signal a move towards extensive use of finite subordination. This means that the first finding from Study 1, the preference for finite and avoidance of non-finite forms, is supported by the findings from Study 2. The next subsection will see whether the results for Reported Speech could also be confirmed.

4.2.2. Reported Speech

Study 1 revealed a clear dominance of Dutch-style finite reported speech structures in NL-Turkish. This section looks into what happens when the participants had to repeat stimulus items with finite direct RS or indirect non-finite RS in the subordinate clauses. Recall that non-finite indirect RS constructions did not occur at all in the conversational immigrant Turkish data.

The following 3 tables show statistically significant differences between bilinguals and monolinguals (all based on chi-square test results with p values significant at the 0.05 level). Table 6 presents the general overview of RS usage of the Turkish-Dutch bilinguals in the

Netherlands and the Turkish monolinguals in Turkey, including their responses both with finite direct RS and non-finite indirect RS stimuli. For the monolinguals, 64% of the stimulus items triggered a non-finite response (indirect RS), while this number was only 35% for the bilinguals. Obviously, this means that no less than 65% of the responses of bilinguals concerned a finite construction (direct RS). The general overview in table 6 evidently confirms the TR-Turkish preference for non-finite structures and the NL-Turkish one for direct RS.

Table 6. RS total (finite + non-finite stimuli)

Bilinguals (675 / 700)		Monolinguals (311 / 350)	
Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
65%	35%	36%	64%

Tables 7 and 8 give the more specific results per type of stimulus item. Table 7 displays the results of the responses to finite direct RS stimuli. In 44% of the cases, monolinguals responded with a non-finite indirect structure, whereas this was only done in 11% of the cases by bilinguals. Therefore, 89% of the finite direct RS stimuli were preserved by the bilinguals.

Table 7. RS with finite stimuli

Bilinguals (407 / 420)		Monolinguals (188 / 210)	
Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
89%	11%	56%	44%

Finally, Table 8 shows the outcomes with non-finite indirect RS stimuli. In 27% of the cases, bilinguals changed it to a finite direct RS structure during the repetition; only 5% of the monolingual data show this pattern.

Table 8. RS with non-finite stimuli

Bilinguals (268 / 280)		Monolinguals (123 / 140)	
Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
27%	73%	5%	95%

In short, Study 2 confirmed the RS results of Study 1. We conclude that the NL-Turkish speakers prefer the type of RS, with finite subordination, that is most like the Dutch construction. TR-Turkish, on the other hand, appears to make use of non-finite indirect RS significantly more frequently than the finite direct option.

5.   Conclusions and discussion

The findings from the two studies indicate that a certain degree of contact-induced change is in evidence, as subordination in immigrant Turkish is clearly different from subordination in TR-Turkish. A consistent pattern was observed in which the bilinguals showed a preference for finite subordination, probably not coincidentally the type that resembles Dutch structure most. TR-Turkish is claimed to prefer non-finite structures, and indeed the data from our sentence recall experiment, which was also carried out by Turkish monolinguals from Turkey, lend support to this. The differences were particularly striking in the case of reported speech, with an almost complete avoidance of the TR-Turkish structure combining a non-finite clause containing the reported speech in indirect form and a matrix verb of saying, instead favoring the use of direct reported speech, in its canonical form with a finite subordinate clause containing the 'quotation' co-occurring with a verb of saying. This concluding section will attempt to account for these results, and explore the reasons for the observed contact-induced changes.

In the literature on contact-induced language change, there is some discussion about whether findings such as these really represent syntactic change (Muntendam forthc.). Partially in response to this debate we endeavored to collect converging evidence from two different sources, spontaneous conversational language use and responses to a sentence recall task. The fact that the data from both sources converge suggests that the apparent Dutch influence visible in speech is not just the result of momentary interference. TR-Turkish and NL-Turkish speakers also differ in a task in which they are explicitly invited to 'improve' sentences that contain an alleged typical feature of NL-Turkish, i.e. finite subordination, with NL-Turkish speakers leaving the finite pattern in place. In other words, they 'accept' the NL-Turkish structure as normal.

Yet, it is also clear that if it is change we are dealing with here, it's a change that is still in progress. NL-Turkish speakers do use non-finite subordination structures, and they do sometimes 'correct' a finite structure to a non-finite one in the recall task. Their competence

should be described as containing both kinds of structures, and it remains to be seen to what extent they are in competition with one another. It was beyond the scope of this article to do a detailed analysis of when which structure is preferred, but it stands to reason that certain matrix verbs are more likely to co-occur with a finite subordinate clause than others. In many cases, finite subordination occurred with matrix verbs of mental activity, such as 'believe', 'think', or 'say'. The results for Reported Speech should probably be seen in this light: it is a structure that particularly favors finite complements. Information on this will allow us to describe in more precise terms the scenario along which the change unfolds. Impressionistic qualitative analysis of the data suggests that even an eminently syntactic domain such as subordination changes in a 'lexical' manner: sub-constructions with particular matrix verbs change first, for various reasons, and cumulatively they may reach the point where the type frequency of NL-Turkish finite subordination structures has become so high that it is clear that the syntactic pattern has been established as a feature of the contact variety. It is unlikely that the syntactic feature (from non-finite to finite subordination) changes overnight.

It is probably significant that TR-Turkish already had the possibility to use finite subordination, and in fact prefers it in particular lexical environments. In addition, it liberally employs finite coordinated clauses (see Section 2.1.1). The Dutch-style structure is not new. In formalist theoretical accounts, this would be reason to claim that there is no syntactic change at all, since the 'new' structure was already part of the speakers' competence. We favor the view, however, in which diffusion across new lexical environments, and perhaps a shift in what is considered the default way of constructing subordinate clauses, does count as change, and in fact constitutes the canonical case.

Another question that comes up is from what perspective we should interpret the increased use of finite subordination and consequently the decreased use of non-finite structure in the speech of the bilinguals. Is it more accurately portrayed in a 'positive' way as the reflection of higher entrenchment levels of the finite structures in the mental representations of NL-Turkish speakers, or in a 'negative' way as the *avoidance* of non-finite structures, or are these two sides of the same coin? In the absence of clear data that point to greater accuracy for either of these interpretations, we suggest that they are likely indeed to be two sides of the same coin: initial interference has caused rising entrenchment levels of the finite options, causing further use of them, which in turn causes lower rates of use of the non-finite structures, in turn causing lower entrenchment levels for them (cf. Croft 2000: 73). Lower entrenchment likely causes doubts about whether or

not one actually can form them correctly, causing both avoidance of the non-finite structure and selection of its finite alternative, which, at other times, also gets selected on the strength of its own ever-growing entrenchment level. If there is anything to this scenario, it should be measurable diachronically, as it presupposes an unstable dynamic system in the individual speaker. Stability in the selection patterns of the same speaker over time would be a counterargument. However, even if this scenario makes sense, the question still needs to be answered as to why there was the initial interference that got the process started. Subordination may be particularly vulnerable in our specific case, because it is generally more frequent in relatively formal varieties, such as the academic register. Growing up in the Turkish immigrant community, there's little exposure to the academic register in Turkish, as most of it occurs in school, where Dutch is the ambient language

We have refrained from considering the bigger picture of NL-Turkish as a variety. A comprehensive view of the immigrant variety as a whole would look at a range of aspects to see whether Dutch influence can be detected across that whole range. That exercise is beyond the scope of a single study such as this one, but the body of evidence provided by a number of studies (see Backus forthc. for a summary) certainly suggests that the influence on Turkish subordination strategies that we have demonstrated in this article is not limited to this domain.

Addresses:
    Pelin Onar Valk and Ad Backus
    School of Humanities
    Tilburg University
    PO Box 90153
    5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands
E-mails: pelinonar@gmail.com, a.m.backus@uvt.nl

References

Backus, Ad (Forthc.) "Turkish as an immigrant language in Europe". In Tej K. Bhatia and William C. Ritchie, eds. *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*. 2nd ed. (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics.) Oxford: Blackwell.

Backus, Ad, A. Seza Doğruöz, and Bernd Heine (2011) "Salient stages in contact-induced grammatical change: evidence from synchronic vs. diachronic contact situations". *Language Sciences* 33, 738–752.

Croft, William (2000) *Explaining language change: an evolutionary approach*. Harlow: Longman.

Doğruöz, Seza and Ad Backus (2009) "Innovative constructions in Dutch Turkish: an assessment of on-going contact-induced change". *Bilingualism: Language & Cognition* 12, 1, 41–63.

Friedman, Victor (2003) *Turkish in Macedonia and beyond: studies in contact, typology, and other phenomena in the Balkans and the Caucasus*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Göksel, Aslı and Celia Kerslake (2005) *Turkish, a comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.

Gullberg, Marianne, Peter Indefrey, and Pieter Muysken (2009) "Research techniques for the study of code-switching". In Barbara E. Bullock and Jacqueline A. Toribio, eds. *The Cambridge handbook on linguistic code-switching*, 21–39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva (2005) *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kornfilt, Jaklin (1997) *Turkish grammar*. London: Routledge.

Matras, Yaron (2009) *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matras, Yaron and Jeannette Sakel (2007) "Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence". *Studies in Language* 31, 829–865.

Muntendam, Antje (Forthc.) "On the nature of cross-linguistic transfer: a case study of Andean Spanish". *Bilingualism: Language & Cognition*.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (2006) *Multiple voices: an introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Rehbein, Jochen, Annette Herkenrath, and Birsel Karakoç (2009) "Turkish in Germany – on contact-induced language change of an immigrant language in the multilingual landscape of Europe". *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 62, 3, 171–204.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen (2008) "The limits of convergence in language contact". *Journal of Language Contact* 2, 213–224.

Thomason, Sarah Grey (2001) *Language contact: an introduction*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Winford, Donald (2003) *An introduction to contact linguistics*. London: Blackwell.

Kokkuvõte. Pelin Onar Valk ja Ad Backus: Süntaktiline muutus türgi sisserännanute keeles: infiniitsed ja finiitsed kõrvallaused. Euroopa türgi immigrantide keel on mõjutatud Euroopa keeltest, mida nad kasutavad lisaks oma emakeelele. Keelekontakti tulemusel on aeglaselt aga kindlalt tekkimas uued türgi keele variandid, kust osad elemendid on ära kaotatud kuhu samas uusi sõnu ja struktuure juurde laenatud. Selle artikli fookus on Hollandi türgi keelel, eelkõige selle kõrvallausete moodustamise mallidel. Võrreldakse Türgi ja Hollandi türgi keelt, analüüs põhineb spontaansetel vestlustel ja lause kor-

damise eksperimentidel. Selgub, et Hollandi türgi keele rääkijad eelistavad finiitseid kõrvallauseid, eriti kaudse kõne puhul, mis on selge hollandi keele mõju: Türgis räägitavas türgi keeles on kõrvallaused üldjuhul infiniitsed. Tulemusi tõlgendatakse kasutuspõhises perspektiivis keelekontaktile.

Märksõnad: kontaktist tulenev muutus, kõrvallaused, kaudne kõne, suhtlusandmed, eksperimentaalsed andmed, türgi keel