

MULTILINGUAL
MATTERS

BILINGUALISM AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Turkish Speakers in North Western Europe

Edited by J. Normann Jørgensen

Bilingualism and Social Relations

Turkish Speakers in North Western Europe

Edited by
J. Normann Jørgensen

MULTILINGUAL MATTERS LTD
Clevedon • Buffalo • Toronto • Sydney

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Bilingualism and Social Relations: Turkish Speakers in North Western Europe

Edited by J. Normann Jørgensen.

Includes bibliographical references.

1. Bilingualism—Europe, Western. 2. Turks—Europe, Western—Languages.

3. Youth—Europe, Western—Language. 4. Social interaction in youth.

I. Jørgensen, J. Normann.

P115.5.E85 B55 2003

404'.2'094—dc21 2002015686

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue entry for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 1-85359-650-7 (hbk)

Multilingual Matters Ltd

UK: Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall, Victoria Road, Clevedon BS21 7HH.

USA: UTP, 2250 Military Road, Tonawanda, NY 14150, USA.

Canada: UTP, 5201 Dufferin Street, North York, Ontario M3H 5T8, Canada.

Australia: Footprint Books, PO Box 418, Church Point, NSW 2103, Australia.

Copyright © 2003 J. Normann Jørgensen and the authors of individual chapters.

This book is also available as Vol. 24, Nos 1&2, 2003 of the *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*.

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed and bound in Great Britain by the Cromwell Press Ltd.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| J. Normann Jørgensen: Linguistic Construction and Negotiation of Social Relations Among Bilingual Turkish-speaking Adolescents in North-western Europe | 1 |
| Volker Hinnenkamp: Mixed Language Varieties of Migrant Adolescents and the Discourse of Hybridity | 12 |
| İnci Dirim and Andreas Hieronymus: Cultural Orientation and Language use among Multilingual Youth Groups: 'For me it is like we all speak one language' | 42 |
| Jakob Cromdal: The Creation and Administration of Social Relations in Bilingual Group Work | 56 |
| Trine Esdahl: Language Choice as a Power Resource in Bilingual Adolescents' Conversations in the Danish <i>Folkeskole</i> | 76 |
| Lian Malai Madsen: Power Relationships, Interactional Dominance and Manipulation Strategies in Group Conversations of Turkish-Danish Children | 90 |
| Erica Huls, Ad Backus, Saskia Klomps and Jens Normann Jørgensen: Adolescents Involved in the Construction of Equality in Urban Multicultural Settings | 102 |
| J. Normann Jørgensen: Languaging Among Fifth Graders: Code-switching in Conversation 501 of the Køge Project | 126 |

Mixed Language Varieties of Migrant Adolescents and the Discourse of Hybridity¹

Volker Hinnenkamp

FH Fulda University of Applied Sciences, Intercultural Communication and European Studies, Fulda, Germany

This paper is a study of mixed language use within the frame of interactional sociolinguistics. Adolescents of Turkish background in Germany have developed their own patterns of bilingualism, in particular mixed varieties of German and Turkish. By the analysis of some transcribed examples of Turkish–German mixed speech (code-switching, code-mixing, code-oscillation, stylised forms of ‘Immigrant German’) it is shown that the switching and mixing oscillates between local sequential functions and a more global ‘We-group’-function. The particular role assigned to ‘speaking mixed’ can only be appreciated against the specific background of the German migratory discourse. The adolescents’ use of hybrid language is an attempt at appropriating semantic space where their language is no longer the object of the migratory discourse as defined by majority society but constitutes an autonomous and exclusive form of (counter-) discourse in its own right.

Across a whole range of cultural forms there is a ‘syncretic’ dynamism which critically *appropriates* elements from the mastercodes of the dominant culture and ‘creolises’ them, disarticulating given signs and re-articulating their symbolic meaning otherwise. The subversive force of this hybridizing tendency is most apparent at the level of language itself where creoles, patois and Black English decentre, destabilise and carnivalise the linguistic domination of ‘English’. (Mercer, 1988: 57)

Introduction

At around lunchtime at the school complex Alter Postweg in Augsburg hundreds of pupils pour into the tram. A multilingual jumble of voices arises. What reaches my ears is not only German, Turkish, Greek, Russian and other languages, but I can also hear mixed conversations in German and Turkish, German and Greek, or German and Russian, in which languages are switched at breathtaking speed. I listen, amazed by the pupils’ virtuosity, until my research interest takes me back to academic soberness, knowing that these adolescents’ and kids’ linguistic productions are hardly valued, and not at all respected, in the school classes they have just left. Monolingualism and German alone is what counts there. However, the conversations outside the official lessons’ discourse literally do speak another language; one that is varied and diverse, mixed, polyphonic and multilingual. This ‘language’ is ignored and despised by majority society and by the official guardians of the language norm. It is not seen as the logical, and likewise antithetical, outcome of a development that has its roots in the history of recent migration (since the 1960s) and in the consequential emergence of polylingual, polycultural and multiethnic areas in many urban centres in Germany (and elsewhere).

The linguistic result of this situation is what is nowadays called ‘hybrid language’. In the following sections I present a few instances of this language, and show that although many of the examples of mixing may be explained by the local functions they serve within the sequential proceeding of a conversation, its emergence can finally only be understood within the context of migration history and the particular form of hybridity discourse it has fostered. Despite being called a ‘mixed’ or ‘hybrid’ language, the speech samples described are in no way homogeneous. However, they have many features in common. The most prominent is, of course, the switching between the languages we call ‘German’ and ‘Turkish’. The degree of switching and mixing is highly differentiated, as are the various functions within their interactional logic. What we find is a whole spectrum of bilingual patternings up to genuinely new and autonomous – some would say ‘creolised’ – forms, which do not belong to either of the languages involved. But that is not the only source of variation. Jargonised and dialectal features, and ethnolectal stylisations, also form part of the resources that are exploited for the switching and mixing of the language varieties involved. All of these I call ‘mixed language varieties’.

The basis for my analysis is conversations between bilingual adolescents of ethnic Turkish background whose parents or grandparents had originally immigrated as ‘Gastarbeiter’ (guest workers) to West Germany (cf. Hinnenkamp, 1980; Sassen, 1996; Terkessidis, 2000). The conversations were audiotaped and partly videotaped in informal gatherings. It was mostly one of the participating parties that did the recordings. In most situations the adolescents did not know what kind of data the researcher was looking for.² The majority of my informants were between 15 and 18 years old; some recordings were also made from the conversations of university students between the ages of 20 and 25. With some of the informants I conducted in-depth interviews about their usage of ‘mixed language’.

Most speakers in my data are male. Just one of my recordings contain female ‘protagonists’. But the gender bias is solely due to the chain of my informants (male adolescents ask other male adolescents to make the recordings, for example). In female groups there is a similar range of switching and mixing, as can be seen from the data of the Mannheim project (cf. Kallmeyer *et al.*, 2000).

The excerpts I present here are solely those which include ‘heavy’ mixing and switching; not all the data did. Many stretches of talk were conducted more or less monolingually, mostly in Turkish. I ignored data with single item insertions and those where the switches were due to addressing monolingual participants.

From the Local-rhetorical Logic of Interaction to ‘Fuzzy Mix’: No Language Mixing *à la carte*

Thematic and contextual contrasts

The following excerpt is a sequence from a discussion between two 16-year-old friends, Ercan (E) and Hakan (H), about an ‘Initiativkreis’ (Interest Group), a kind of social club for ‘foreign’ adolescents.³ Both speakers grew up in Germany and go to the final class of secondary school (Hauptschule). The conversation takes place at Hakan’s home:

(E-1) Transcript 'Initiativkreis' (Interest Group)

- 1 H: *Nerde bu Initiativkreis?*
Where is this interest group (initiative circle)?
- 2 E: *Richtung Stadt böyle, ordan dümdüz gittiğin zaman*
It's about direction of town if you go straight from there
- 3 *Königsplatz çıkıyor karşına*
you get to Königsplatz,
- 4 H: *Ja::::, ich weiß [(...)]*
Yeahhhh, I know (...)
- 5 E: *[Kennst du schon?*
You know that already?
- 6 H: *Ja*
Yes
- 7a E: *Ja,*
Yes,
- 7b *işte ordan tam böyle hani o Initiativkreis tam böyle*
just from there that is that interest group's place comes right up
- 8 *Mitteye geliyor.*
in the middle.
- 9 *O Einbahnstraße[nin tam Mitesinde böyle*
From the one-way street just quite exactly in the middle
- 10 H: *[Mhh*
- 11 E: *Or- [orda*
The- there
- 12 H: *[Was is das fürn Ding, so kolpingmäßig, oder?*
What kind of place is that, just kolpinglike or what?
- 13 E: **Nein**, nicht kolpingmäßig >{böyle/ eh}
Lernstudio,
No, not kolpinglike >{so/ uh}< learning studio,
((Com.: 'Kolping' refers to a Catholic welfare institution))
- 14 *saz kursları °so was halt° (+) °ondan sonra° alles mögliche*
saz courses, just like that (+) and then all kinds of things
((Com.: 'saz' is a Turkish string instrument))
- 15 H: *Ja und was bringt des?*
Yeah and what is it good for?
- 16 E: *°Ja, die verdienen Geld°*
Yeah, they make money
- 17 H: *Ja und #((laughing)) orda para kaybediyor yani #*
Yeah and #((laughing)) that means there you lose your money #
- 18 E: *Nnnnnn nich ganz*
Nnnnn not quite
- 19 ((0.6 sec.))
- 20 H: *Ne işe yarıyor?*
What is it good for?
- 21 E: *°Eh e Geld verdienen, Mann°*
Uh u making money, man
- 22 H: *Mann, du verstehst nich was ich meine*
Man, you don't understand what I mean

- 23 E: Eh wie (h) wie *yani*?
Uh how (h) how *you mean*?
- 24 H: *Onlar niçin gidiyor oraya?*
Why do they go there?
- 25 E: *Kimler?*
Who?
- 26 H: Ja, o die Jugendlichen
Yeah, *these* the young people
- 27 E: Die wollen was lernen
They want to learn something
- 28 H: Lernstudiomäßig {*yani*}(?)
Learning studio like {*you mean*}
- 29 E: Lernstudiomäßig (+) ja, alles mögliche, >*ne ararsan var orda*<
Learning studio like (+) yeah, all kinds, >*whatever you look for you find*<
30 alles mögliche
all kinds of things
- 31 H: Cool (+) und nur Türken oder [so oder nur Ausländer?
Cool (+) and only Turks or so or just foreigners?
- 32 E: [Ähhh
Uhhh
- 33 °Ja° + °ziemlich°
yes + rather

The excerpt combines a number of mixed language phenomena. Furthermore, in German as well as in Turkish we find some typical spoken language elisions (such as in ‘*nerde*’ line 1 or in ‘*nich*’ lines 18, 22) as well as dialectal elements (‘*des*’ [dæ:s], line 15); in German there are also some typical youth language expressions like ‘*kolpingmäßig*’ lines 12, 13; ‘*lernstudiomäßig*’, lines 28, 29; or ‘*cool*’ line 31. The numeric relation of German to Turkish is roughly 2 to 1. However, we have to keep in mind that the suffixing principle of an agglutinating language like Turkish may pack much more information into one word. Also some formal aspects of language alternation are worth looking at: 12 out of about 26 turns of speaking lines are monolingually German as opposed to 5 or 6 turns in Turkish (including the insertion ‘*Initiativkreis*’ in line 1). Longer sequences tend to alternate languages. Here we find German dominance as in lines 12f. or Turkish dominance as in line 17. We must bear in mind that looking at the mixed data like this remains purely formal and normative. With a couple of lexemes it is in no way clear to which language they should be attributed; proper and quasi-proper names like ‘*Initiativkreis*’ and ‘*Königsplatz*’ are not counted (lines 1, 3, 7). But what about insertions such as ‘*Mitte*’ and ‘*Einbahnstraße*’ (lines 8 and 9)? By their suffixation we can see how they are fully integrated into Turkish. Although the four word sequence part ‘*O Einbahnstraßenin tam Mittesinde*’ consists of two German content words as opposed to two Turkish functional items is it nonetheless a genuine Turkish sentence.

As we can see a formal approach is very limiting. Just taking my own way of transcribing, intended to make reading easier, that is German in roman, Turkish in *italics*, it remains quite problematic as it proceeds on purely technical grounds according to language assignment.

What is much more promising is taking a look at the switches themselves, such as those between lines 3 and 4, or between lines 11 (7ff. respectively) and 12, 17 and 18; or answering the question why there is a switch at all in line 17 or in lines 28 or 29. Bilingual speakers have both languages available, as we know. Some instances might be explained by word searching difficulties and other competence related reasons. Also, we know of preference principles such as following the previous speaker's choice (Auer, 1988). But there are no really satisfying answers to be found here. Is 'Richtung Stadt *böyle*' the adequate coupling with 'bu Initiativkreis' (line 1f.)? The answer has to be 'no'. In fact, most of the sequence where the 'Initiativkreis' is located is negotiated in Turkish (up to line 11). Then we have a language switch. In what follows there is shift in language dominance (lines 12 to 16). The non-Turkish sequence, lines 4 to 7a, is clearly an insertional sequence in which H tries to explain that the 'Initiativkreis' is in fact already known to him. It constitutes a formal opposition to E's description of where the 'Initiativkreis' is located: it is an autonomous sequence refuting E's over-explicitness (line 4), followed by a checking question (line 5), H's confirmation of that (line 6) and its reconfirmation (line 7a) before both return to the *status quo ante* in line 7b ff. We thus find language choice-wise, as well as contextually, a hierarchical structure.⁴

We come across similar methods of opposing formats in the sequence containing lines 15 to 18, through H's contradiction by his questioning of what the 'Initiativkreis' has to offer (line 15), E's answer (line 16) and H's ridiculing conclusion about that (line 17). For E's mildly formulated protest against this he remains with his prior choice, i.e. German. That is, only in H's concluding statement '*orda para kaybediyor yani*' (line 17) does he make use of this section's contrastive language, Turkish; furthermore, marking it by laughter might also emphasise it as modally contrastive.

Authenticity and narrative refinement

As a matter of fact, formal, contextual and narrative oppositions serve as an ideal background for code-switching. As an example, let's take a look at just a small excerpt from a rather long and extended account where Orhan (O), a student, tells two friends how he happened to meet his old schoolmate Matthias at Munich airport. Ayhan (A), also a student, gives him support at one point.

(E-2) Transcript 'Matthias taucht auf' (Matthias shows up)

- 1 **O:** *İndim, Selda'yı arıyom bakıyom.*
Got out of the car to look for Selda
- 2 *Bi baktım Matthias'ı diyor hey kannsch du mi: mitnehmen?*
Then all of a sudden I see Matthias; says he hey can you give me a lift?
- 3 *Is- isn Freund von mir, mit dem ich früher inner Sch- eh Klasse war.*
He- he's a friend of mine with whom I used to go to sch- uh into the same class.
- 4 *He:, kannschte mi: mitnehmen diyo, eh i hab niemand diyo sonst muss*
Hey, can you give me a lift, he says, uh nobody I know here, he says,
otherwise

waiting for the bus and make nasty comments about the bus driver and the bus service in general.

(E-3) Transcript 'Bushaltestelle' (Bus stop)

- 1 F: *Otobüse binecekmiyiz?*
Will we get on that bus?
- 2 A: #((laughing)) Ich weiss nicht#
I don't know
- 3 F: °{Lan}° + *bugün zaten öğretmen kızmuştı bize*
Son + today the teacher told us off
- 4 A: #((laughing and sucking in air)) Echt oder?#
Really?
- 5 F: *Bugün geç kalmıştım, otobüsü kaçırmıştık*
Today I was a bit late, we missed the bus
- 6 A: *Ben de saat acht'ta geldim camiye, lan hehehehehehehehe*
And I got to the mosque at eight, man
- 7 F: He:: der **Bus**fahrer ist (h)ein **Sack** hey
Hey, the busdriver is a bugger
- 8 A: *Hehehe valla:::h hehe*
really
- 9 F: der kommt (h)der kommt immer zu spät he
he comes he comes always too late ha
- 10 A: *Otobüsün dolu olmasına çok gıcık olyom hey Mann ge + voll*
It really gets on my nerves that the bus is so packed, hey man, ha + full
- 11 F: Ja weisch (+) *girdik* (h) {*giriş/giriyoz = şimdi*} *içeriye*
You know we got in {we got onto the bus/get on now} inside
- 12 A: [((laughs))]
- 13 F: [*bi- bize* (...)] (+) *seid mal leise diyor ehh das regt mich auf hey*
to us (...) (+) *be quiet he says, hu, that really gets on my nerves*
- 14 A: #((laughs for about 3 sec. swallowing words))(...) *hohohohohehehehe*
- 15 *İyi mi? kötü mü?#* ((sucks in air))
Is that fair or is that bad?
- 16 F: ((enervated)) Eh **komm** jetzt
Eh come on now
- 17 A: ((self-controlled, with deep voice)) *Ya tamam burdayız=lan*
Yes alright, here we are=man
- 18 F: Wo bleibt der Bus hey
Where's the bus, hey
- 19 ((1 second))
- 20 A: *Ya abi çekiyo* »hasch immer noch was zu sagen, oder?«
Our brother's recording. Still got something to say?
- ((Com.: meaning the interviewer)).
- 21 F: (...)
- 22 ((2.5 seconds))
- 23 A: »*Fenerbahçe'nin en son durumu kaçtı, lan*«
What's Fehnerbahçe's last position, son
- ((Com.: that's a football club))

- 24 F: Ich weiß net (+) ich glaub die ham verloren [(...)
I don' know (+) I think they've lost (...)
- 25 A: [Zwei zu *bir miydi?*
Was it two to one?
- 26 F: Na (+) zwei zu- (+) zwei, glaub=ich
Nope (+) two (+) two, I think
- 27 A: Unentschieden
Draw
- 28 F: Jaja
Oh yeah

The first impression is that the two languages are used more or less evenly (50 Turkish as against 58 German words). Again we find monolingual as well as bilingual sequences. A type of alternation we could spell out as 'Speaker 1 speaks language A, speaker 2 language B' is found e.g. in lines 1 to 5 or lines 6 to 9. Line 5 and 6 are in Turkish only and the last lines of the excerpt are almost only in German. Also, within a turn we find those typical one-word insertions like 'acht' in line 6. In lines 10, 11, 13, 20 and 25 we find switches within the respective turns which, in my opinion, are syntactically as well as functionally quite comprehensible. If we take line 13 as an example, we can immediately see that we have (a) the Turkish bracketing of a German quote and (b) the ensuing commenting of the quoted occurrence, a rhetorical and thematic differentiation by means of the two languages, German and Turkish. Or line 20, for example, is an obvious case of addressee specification: in the Turkish part, A refers to the Turkish student (in 3rd person) who makes the recording; in the German part – spoken in an accelerated manner – the immediate addressee is his mate F (in the 2nd person). Even if not every single switch is explicable, it is quite obvious that most of them nicely comply to phrase boundaries [/ /] such as in line 10: '*Otobüsüin dolu olmasma çok gıcık olyom* // hey Mann ge + voll' or in line 11 '*Ja weisch (+) // girdik (h) {giriş/giriyoż=şimdi} içeriye*'.

Not all alternations, however, stick to these boundary rules. In line 25 '*Zwei zu bir miydi?*' (*Was it two to one?*) the switch 'respects' no other boundary than just that between words. Its rhetorical function remains obscure. And if we once more take a look at the language alternation distribution according to speaking turn and speaker, more puzzles come up: the first five speaking turns seem to be characterised by the different language dominance of the interlocutors: F speaks Turkish, A replies in German. This might correspond to individual language preference or to the degree of (un)certainly in the respective languages. In the next turn, however, (line 6) A switches to Turkish, thus complying with F's language choice. Surprisingly, F continues in German (line 7), likewise in the turns to follow (lines 8 to 10) we find the above pattern inverted before both speakers use both languages within their turns (lines 10, 11 und 13). To conclude: thus far we have not really found a reliable pattern of interturn language alternation unless we declare the maxim '*Don't use prior speaker's language!*' as at least valid for parts of the conversation. We would thus have discovered a further pattern based on opposition – on formal speaking turn opposition. There is not much narrative or dramaturgical logic behind that; more the potential for playing with oppositional resources. What, we have to ask, is it that stimulates

the adolescents to conduct their conversational interchanges in such manifold code alternating ways – comprehensible as well as surprising ways?

From extensive alternations to oscillations: About the successive increase of mixing density

We find extensive patterns of alternations side by side with intensive patterns. The following two excerpts stem from a rather long account about a dramatic accident with nearly fatal consequences. The excerpt 'Accident I' is from the introductory part of the account, 'Accident II' is about 12 minutes later when it comes to a dramatic climax within the narration.

Nineteen-year old Remzi (R) is the narrator. He came to Germany when he was eight years old and is still in vocational training. His listener is 15-year-old Yasemin (Y). She was born in Germany and goes to grammar school. The two are at R's home. Y, who has not yet been informed about how the accident happened, is an eager listener to R's detailed descriptions.

(E-4) Transcript 'Accident I'

- 1 **R:** *A- arkadaşşıma gittim {bilyomusun} kaza yaptılar*
I had gone to my friend {you know} they had the accident
- 2 **Y:** *Wo?*
Where
- 3 **R:** *Bilmiyom. Hab i dir des nicht verzählt oder?*
I don't know. Haven't I told you that?
- 4 **Y:** *°Hayır°*
No
- 5 **R:** *Ach so. Ich wa:r + halt mit (h) meim (h) Freund bissl unterwegs +*
I see. I was just away with my friend
- 6 *»{und dann/ondan} dedik ki arkadaşşımuza gidelim dedik*
{then/because of that} we thought let's go to see our friend
- 7 *kaza yaptık, [ya (?) geçen cuma«*
we had this accident last Friday
- 8 **Y:** [Mh
- 9 **R:** *İşte bir hafta oldu ya + camideydik (+) sonra işte + bir iki*
About a week ago + we were in the mosque (+) then + we were one two
- 10 *dört kişiydik dört arkadaş Kenan, Tahir (+) ich und Ahmet +*
four of us were there, four friends Kenan, Tahir (+) me and Ahmet +
- 11 *und dann sind dort zwei dazu kommen Taner'le Baki geldiler +*
there two others came as well Taner and Baki came
- 12 *Katzdorf'da oturuyorlar, ya(?). Namazı kıldıktan sonra camide*
they live in Katzdorf, you know(?). After praying in the mosque
- 13 *+ kahve içmeye gidelim dediler bize +*
+ they said to us come on let's have a cup of coffee +
- 14 *pe- peki tamam. Neriye gidelim? (+) Lauenberg'e gidelim*
ri- right, okay. Where should we go? (+) Let's go to Lauenberg
- 15 *»hani Taner orda« nişanlandı ya(?)*
that's where Taner has his fiancée, right(?)

- 16 Y: Ja ja eh eh in (h) zwei Autos oder in drei Autos?
Yes yes uh uh in two cars or in three cars
- 17 R: *İki arabayla, ja zwei Autos. Aber es war ja so: + wir ham bloß ein*
With two cars, yes two cars. But it happened like this + we just had one
- 18 *Auto da gehabt. Bende yayan gitmiştim Camiye=Kenan'lar*
car with us. I had walked to the mosque=Kenan and
- 19 *Ahmet de sonradan geldi (+) Baki'ler Taner de bir arabayla*
Ahmet came later as well (+) Baki and Taner seem to have come by car
- 20 *gelmişler (+)karar verdik kahve içmeye*
(+) we decided to go for a cup of coffee
- 21 *gidicez Lauenberg'e. Çıktık camiden (+) sonra tabii bir araba var*
to Lauenberg. We came out of the mosque (+) then of course we had a car
- 22 *altı kişi, sığmıca:z bir arabaya (+)*
we were six but didn't fit into one car (+)
- 23 *ne yapalım edelim Taner bana sordu*
so what should we do, Taner asked me
- 24 *araban burdamı diye yok evde dedim. Ahmet'e de sordu*
if my car was there, no, it's at home, I said. He asked Ahmet as well
- 25 *Ahmet'in ki de Tiefgarage deydi +*
Ahmet's car was in the underground car park, he said +
- 26 *°ondan sonra° ben dedim beni eve atsın Baki arabayı alıp geliyim*
and then I said Baki should bring me home so I could go and get my car
- 27 *iki arabayla gidelim dedi{m} (+)*
then we can go with two cars {he/I} said (+)
- 28 *Ahmet te aynı Vorschla/kı (+) söyledi (+) und die ham*
and Ahmet made the same proposal (+) and they said no
- 29 *abglehnt °{halt}°, weisch, die ham alle beide so Sportautos-*
you know, both of them have these sport cars
- 30 Y: Echt so [Zweisitzer?
Really this kind of two-seat car?
- 31 R: {Ja}
 {Yes}
- 32 *Ne ne scho Viersitzer aber so: + hohe PS-Zahl und so, weisch do*
No no normal four seat car but with really high HP etc, you know
- 33 *und so richtig Farbe*
and real colour ((i.e. power))
- 34 Y: *Ama Taner'in ki Zweisitzer değil mi? (+)*
But is the one of Taner not a two-seat car?

So much for the first excerpt from the beginning of the accident account. Most of what R says is in Turkish, Y responds in German as well as in Turkish. Her short contributions correspond to her role as listener. In addition, there are some, quite short and comprehensible, sequences of code alternation that inform us about unequally distributed dominances in either language. In line 16 Y's checking question is in German, not in the hitherto dominating language of the account. R responds first in Turkish but he then repeats the prepositional phrase in German. He eventually answers the question in German; the story, however, continues in Turkish: '*İki arabayla, / / ja zwei Autos. Aber es war ja so:*

+ wir ham bloß ein Auto da gehabt. // *Bende yayan gitmiştim Camiye=Kenan'lar Ahmet de sonradan geldi ...'* (line 18f). Also, another sequence adds to this suspicion of unequally distributed competences: in line 28f. R alters into German '*Ahmet te aynu Vorschla/kı (+) söyledi (+)* // und die ham ablehnt {halt}, weisch, die ham alle beide so Sportautos-' and it is just here that R is interrupted by another checking question by Y – in German (line 30): 'Echt so Zweisitzer?'. And R answers in German (line 32f.): 'Ne ne scho Viersitzer aber so: + hohe PS-Zahl und so, weisch do und so richtig Farbe'. One gets the impression that R changes into German to play a speaking turn on to Y. However, in the next line this pattern is reversed when Y asks in Turkish: '*Ama Taner'inki Zweisitzer değil mi?*' (line 34).

Thus, we find at least some insights into some of the patterns of the participants' code-switching behaviour. Other examples contradict these patterns. The main narrative line in the excerpt discussed is in Turkish; there is no doubt about which is the matrix language. More astonishing, however, is the development of the narrative to quite a dense oscillation of languages at the point where the dramaturgy of the accident seems to dominate the account, as we can see in the following excerpt.

(E-5) Transcript 'Accident II'

- 1 **R:** *Ondan sonra o lafı bitmiş (+) tam o viraj gelince (+) hatta gmeint*
 Then that subject seem to be finished (+) just the very moment when the
 curve showed up (+) he thought
- 2 *durch den Nebel (+) dass da ne grade Strecke kommt, doch kei*
 because of the fog (+) that the next bit was straight, no
- 3 *Kurve, grade Strecke. Dann ist er in der Kurve dindirek*
 curve, just straight on. Then in the curve he straightly came off
- 4 *yoldan çıktı (+) ağaca çarptılar*
 the road (+) into a tree,
- 5 *ağaca çarpmışlar*
 and obviously got right into a tree
- 6 **Y:** *Es- is da jemand verletzt worden?*
 Did- did anybody get hurt?
- 7 **R:** *(h)arkadaşım ikinci Wirbeli kırıldı eğer üçüncü Wirbel*
 one friend broke his second vertebra if it had been the third vertebra
- 8 *°wenns gebrochen wär,wär er normal tot° (+) °°da wär er nicht*
 if it had been broken he would be dead by normal (+) he would not
- 9 *mehr jetzt (h)unter uns°°*
 be with us anymore
- 10 **Y:** *Ehm, Beifahrerin yerindemi oturuyodu oder (h)was?*
 Uh did he sit on the passenger seat or what?
- 11 **R:** *Yo:, Ahmet, Ahmet arkada oturuyodu aber er hat sich nicht*
 No, Ahmet, Ahmet sat in the back but he hadn't had his belt on
- 12 *angeschnallt ghabt, er hat sein Gurt irgendwie nicht gefunden,*
 he somehow hadn't found his belt,
- 13 *weisch, wo wo so drauf gsteckt war irgendwie*
 you know, where where it's tagged on was somehow
- 14 *unterm Sitz versteckt (+) i weiß au net, hat es irgendwie net*

- 15 hidden away under the seat (+) I don't know either, somehow didn't
 gefunden und dann nach dem Roller wo wir *yol giderken* (+)
 find it and then after the scooter ((they had nearly knocked over
 before)) *where we continued*
- 16 plötzlich warn sie weg + wir sind schnell hinterher, weischt du
 they had somehow disappeared + we went faster to catch up, you
 know
- 17 (+) aber wir sind dann schneller geworden *hızlı sürmeğe başladı*
 (+) but we speeded up *he began to speed up as well*
- 18 *yakalyalım onları diye* (+) *ama yoklardı*
to catch up with them I think (+) *but they've been away*
- 19 *{ortadan} kaybolmuşlardı* (+) *nasıl olduysa*
somehow they had disappeared (+) *however it might have happened*
- 20 Y: Siz görmedinizmi onların (h)*[çıkışını*
Didn't you see how they got off
- 21 R: *[Yo: direkmen çıktığını biz görmedik*
No, the very moment they got off the road we
didn't see
- 22 *ondan sonra virajı biz yavaş döndük Taner biliyormuş dass da* (+)
then we just took the curve softly, Taner seem to know (+) *hat there was*
- 23 scharfe [Kurve ist (+)
 a sharp curve
- 24 Y: [Kurve
 curve
- 25 R: und dann plötzlich ham wir alle *sağ tarafa baktık* (+) Kenan,
 and then all of a sudden we all *looked to the right* (+) Kenan
- 26 Ahmet- Kenan, Taner und ich. *Ondan sonra, das war wie im*
 Ahmet- Kenan, Taner and I. *And then, that was like on*
- 27 Fernseh, weisch, wenn du so von Rally-Autos Unfälle siehsch
 television, you know, when you see these kind of accidents from
 rally-cars
- 28 *aynı televizyondaki kazalar gibiydi* (+)
was just like those accidents on television (+)
- 29 *bi baktık {karp-} alle blicken nach rechts*
we looked {...} all looked to the right
- 30 Y: *Şey olmuşmuydu überschlagen?*
Was it uhm turned upside down?
- 31 R: *Yok, über- hats nicht überschlagen* (+) *yapmamışlar=iyiki ondan*
No, upside- no didn't turn upside down (+) *they didn't=how lucky they*
were
- 32 *önce iki aşacın arasından geçmişler iki ağactan birine çarpsalar*
before they drew right through between two trees, had they hit one of the two
trees,
- 33 *zaten takla atalardı bilyomusun* (+) *ondan sonra hepimiz ham wir*
they would have toppled, you know (+) *and after that all of us we looked*
- 34 auf einmal nach rechts geschaut (+) wir sind alle **voll** blass
 to the right all of a sudden (+) our faces just turned pale

- 35 geworden °im Gesicht° *ondan sonra* Taner hat zurückgeschaut
and then Taner looked back
- 36 *Kenan baktı Taner'e ben de ikisine bakıyorum* (+) Taner hat
Kenan looked to Taner and I looked to both of them (+) Taner
- 37 gesagt °kaza yapmılar°. Und dann hat er Vollbremsung eingelegt
 said *they seem to have made an accident*. And then he really slammed on
 the brakes
- 38 *hemen arabayı park ettik kenara* (+) wir sind aus dem Auto raus
we parked the car at the side of the road (+) we got out of the car
- 39 *gesprungen arabadan nasıl çıktımızı bilmiyoz* (+) *yolu nasıl geçtim*
but how we got out of it we don't know (+) *how I crossed the road*
- 40 *karşı tarafa kaza tarafın onu bilmiyon={eğer} bi araba gelse*
how I got to where the accident had happened I dont know={if} a car had come
- 41 hätt es mich grad überfahren.
 it would have just knocked me over.

In this excerpt there are 26 instances of language alternation within an utterance, not including the integrated one-word switches like 'Wirbel' (line 7) or 'Beifahrer' (line 10). As we deal here with the roles of narrator and listener, there are only four switches between turns. Of course, some of the switches are easily comprehensible again. Take for example the emphasis in line 37f. 'Taner hat gesagt °kaza yapmışlar°' where Taner is probably authentically quoted; this is, furthermore, doubly marked by lowered voice as well as by language choice. At other places we find German–Turkish doublings such as: 'aber wir sind dann schneller geworden *hızlı sürmeğe başladı*' (line 17f.); or 'das war wie im Fernseh, weisch, wenn du so von Rally-Autos Unfälle siehst *aynu televizyondaki kazalar gibiydi*' (lines 26–28). Redoublings of this kind can either function as stylistic-rhetorical emphases or as concessions *vis-à-vis* a bilingually less competent partner.

Irrespective of not being able to find plausible explanations for each single switch, such local, stylistic and competence-oriented assignments to a switch's function do not inform us about the increase of switching and mixing density. It seems that the degree of mixing is made a criterion for the narration's quality, so to speak. We might well conclude that the increase of narrative density, of dramaturgy and of emotional involvement corresponds to the increase and density of language alternations. The document at hand nicely displays the richness of switching variations. This includes, of course, language internal variation, in particular dialect variation, with which the accident account abounds. Variation, unless arbitrary, after all, is always an expression of variable competence. Thus, stylistic-rhetorical, recipient-designed and metaphorical alternations of language are hardly to be gauged as deficits in bilingual competence, rather the opposite: they are an expression of skilfully handling different languages, varieties and registers simultaneously.

Formally we deal with alternating forms which move to and fro between insertions, code-switching and code-mixing. There are phases of clearly negotiated switches, and of contextually relevant and plausible alternations; but there are also phases of increasingly dense and accelerated language alternations.

‘Code-oscillation’ is a good term for this constant shift in density and functionality. This is, of course, a purely formal description. It does not explain why even among a constant constellation of participants (and even a constant participation framework, we might add) the mixing and switching takes place in such a highly differentiated and variable way.

Uncertainties in language competence may always be cited as one reason for code-switching: if one speaker does not know how to continue in one language he or she may revert to the other available language. This is often indicated by signs of uncertainty, by abortions, self corrections and resumptions in the other language. This, of course, is not the whole story as we know from those fast grammatically correct continuations in another language in the middle of a phrase or a constituent, as in our examples (E-2) line 5/7 and (E-3) line 25 or in (E-5) lines 15 and 25. Those without practice in switching would hardly be able to create these mixed language forms. Compositions of this kind require the apt combination of different grammars, demanding, for example, topological and pre- and postpositional anticipations.⁵

Mixtures of this kind are not infrequent and we should remember that the denser the alternations, the more complex is the grammatical performance in compatibilisation. Reducing them purely to deficits in either of the languages contradicts my empirical findings. Furthermore, many of the things adolescents talk about in a mixed way may also be expressed monolingually in either of the languages alternated. Lack of language competence certainly is not a sufficient explanation for the phenomenon of code-mixing.

Interim result: The limits of local explanations of language alternations

In all the excerpts cited so far, we come across different forms of alternations and switches which we might subsume under the following typology:

- (1) (a) Languages alternate within, as well as between, utterances for which we find either local-sequential reasons in terms of an immediate interactional logic and functionality (negotiated or indexical code-switching), or stylistic-rhetorical reasons (not ruling out both at the same time, of course). Its form is not grammatically or compositionally fixed, and in general it corresponds to phrase structure rules; the switches are likewise extensive.
- (b) Also cognitive reasons and reasons based on competence (as might be documented, for example, by self-corrections, difficulties in finding the proper word or the proper connection) can be decisive for the switch. In (E-1), line 13f. we find a good example of this kind of motivation.
- (c) We also find discursive and recipient-designed routines, mostly ‘external’ to the utterance. Their function is mostly in the stylistic-rhetorical realm and often with a kind of ritual character, as we see in ‘Lernstudiomäßig yani’ (E-1, line 28) or the excerpt below from a conversation documented elsewhere (Hinnenkamp, 2000a) where the comment is underlined:

(E-6)

- 1 E: *Geçen tramvayda gidiyom, biliyonmu + bi tane oğlan*
Recently I took the tram you know + one guy
- 2 das gibt's gar nicht
you wouldn't believe it

(2) Some alternations do not have a comprehensible logical function at the particular place where they occur. They are not seen as a result of negotiation, are neither local or indexical, are obviously not stylistically or rhetorically motivated and do not occur for reasons of incompetence. On the formal level we come across more extensive alternations according to speakers (such as in the transcript (E-3) in which each speaker seemed to respond according to the principle of not using the predecessor's language), but also alternations of the dense kind as we found in (E-1), (E-4) and (E-5). These examples give evidence of switches which cannot be accounted for in terms of their local functions. Furthermore, these kinds of switches do not respect any phrase structure constraints and also create new and autonomous language forms.

It should be noted here that there is no static border between (1) and (2). And, of course, their subsumptions are not totally independent from the observer's interpretative and analytical assumptions. However, this dual categorisation will persist.

If the locally negotiated, and hence meaningful, language switch is made an essential criteria for code-switching, then of course (2) would not count anymore as a proper instance of code-switching. In this sense code-switching is constituted by the meaningful alternation of codes (languages, varieties, types of texts, styles, expressive forms). 'Meaningful' means that the distinction of code X and code Y has a local function and will serve as a resource for the ongoing interaction or for the interpretability of a text. It's the here and now of the alternation that offers the potential for negotiating the next step of the interaction. It leads to such implicit questions as 'how to interpret the switch?', 'what does it mean for the continuation of the interaction?' and 'what of our momentary relationship?'. The alternation may, in an interaction as well as in a text, also serve as an intertextual or metapragmatic commentary: 'why a language switch at this particular point?', 'what does it imply for further interpretation?', 'how is it connected to prior parts of the text?'.

If any local meaningfulness is unretrievable then we have to search for other, more global explanations for language alternation (cf. Auer, 1998a, 1998b; Swigart, 1992). It is here that we might find a semantic correlation between formally different types of alternations: a differentiation between code-switching and code-mixing according to formal criteria looks quite difficult. Extensive and intensive alternations are not essential criteria, although it may be generally stated that more density goes hand-in-hand with more fuzziness. As such, I think that the differentiation holds between code-switching and code-mixing, where code-switching has local relevance and code-mixing does not.

On the other hand, oppositions of this kind are always problematic as they serve as contrastive placats. The ‘higher hierarchies’ of a global analysis as opposed to a local one are also understood as taking the societal level of an act into account. However, as was convincingly shown by analyses in Interactional Sociolinguistics, society always percolates through into every move and speech act of a conversation (cf. Hinnenkamp, 1989, 1990). It’s just the focus that is shifted: whereas local analysis focuses on *hic-et-nunc*-motives for alternations, mostly seen as a rationale of local relevance, global analysis focuses on motives for alternations which can be found in categories such as identity, group cohesion, co-membership, that is, mostly in a rationale of global relevance to the speakers involved. On the other hand, the very fact of talking, be it switching or mixing, in this particular way, can only be understood against the background of Turkish migration and the established discourse of migration. This also situates their way of speaking into the global context of migration and hybridity as an integral part of a one-world globalisation. We do not get precision and sharpness in the internal differentiation of language alternation, a language mixing *à la carte* as I have called it above. We thus have to make do with formally fuzzy boundaries.

Skilful mixtures: Playing with languages and playing with normativity

Polylingualism as a resource for poetic language games

Let us return to the world of language oscillations and their fuzziness. In the next excerpt this aspect of mixing will become clear, as we will be able to see how bilingual competence becomes the resource for language plays and even for a kind of extempore poetry. Excerpt 7 nicely displays the tension between normative consciousness and an awareness of language, and its simultaneous undermining by hybrid language use.

In the following scene, three adolescents Mehmet, Uğur and Kamil, aged 15 and 16, hang around in a self-service shop in their neighbourhood. They buy doughnuts and fool about. At one point Mehmet swallows a piece of his doughnut the wrong way and starts coughing, which Kamil responds to by slapping his back and ironically telling him to enjoy the meal. This prelude continues down to line 5.

(E-7) Transcript ‘Gang-ster’

- 1 **K:** *Afiyet [olsun*
 Enjoy your meal
- 2 **M:** [((coughing))
- 3 **M:** *Afiyetle beraber olsun*
 All of you enjoy it
- 4 **U:** *Geber*
 Die hard!
- 5 **K:** *Afiyet şeker olsun*
 Enjoy it sweet as sugar
- 6 ((2 sec.))
- 7 **U:** *Stirb langsam*
 Die hard
- 8 **M:** *hahaha + bizde (+) kaseti açtı=’stirb langsam’ yazıyor*

- hahaha + *in our place he put in a cassette with the title 'Die hard' on it*
 9 #((gradually starts to laugh))U-Uğur 'sıtrb langsam' okuyor hahaha#
 U- Uğur reads 'sıtrb langsam'
 10 #((Laughing continues for about 6 sec., K. and U. join in))
 11 M: ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha [ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha#
 12 K: #((emerging from laughter)) [Stirb langsam (...)
 Die hard
 13 {sıtrb/stirb} langsam,{Alter}#
 die hard old man
 14 U: {°...°}
 15 M: ((emerging from laughter)) *Bak orda ne yazıyor, Ei-gang* hahaha
Look, what's written there, Ei-gang ((Eingang with a 'n' missing;
 resulting in lit. egg-walk or egg-corridor))
 16 (+) {Ei/Ay}Gang⁶
 (+) egg/moon walk/corridor
 17 U: Ei{n}gang
 18 K: *Nerde bunun {ayı /Ei-i}*
Where is its {moon /egg}
 19 M: **He?**
 Hu? ((What do you mean?))
 20 K: *Nerde bunun {ayı /Ei-i}*
Where is its {moon /egg}
 21 M: ((coughing, gradually merging into laughter)) eh [eh ha ha ha
 22 K: [{}Ay /Ei}-Gäng
 Moon/ egg-gang⁷
 23 M: *Doğru lan*
Right man
 24 U: *Nerde bunun {ayı / Ei-i} oğlum*
Where is its {moon / egg}, son}
 25 M: *Yoa: + #((strong draw)) *{ay/Ei}-yin- gang*# (+) {ay/Ei}{t}gang* haha ya
 No: + moon /egg walk (+) moon /egg walk hahah ya
 26 #((imitating American accent)) **ein** geyn **zwei** geyn#⁸
 27 U: *Ayının Gangı (+) hıhıhı*
the walk of a bear
 28 K: Eingang (+) Zweigang
 Entrance (+) two gear⁹
 29 ((0.5 sec.))
 30 M: **[ha!**
 31 U: [{}Weitergang /zweiter Gang}
 Continuation /second gear /course
 32 K: {°...°}
 33 M: *Dün ne filmleri vardı?*
What kind of films were there yesterday?
 34 U: *Dün mü?*
Yesterday?
 35 K: *Saate baksana*
Just take a look at the time

The episode that is of primary interest here starts after the pause of two seconds, which Uğur introduces with 'Stirb langsam' (line 7). Uğur thus comments on Mehmet's ongoing coughing. 'Stirb langsam' reminds Mehmet of an episode when Uğur pronounced the same title of the video film as 'Sturb langsam' for which he gets a loud laughter in response (line 8–13). The strong reaction is probably due to the pronunciation of 'sturb' for 'stirb'. This epenthesis is regarded as a typical Turkish accent and is highly stigmatised.¹⁰ While still laughing about Uğur's mispronunciation Mehmet directs his friends' attention to a sign in the shop in which they hang around. This sign originally reads 'EINGANG' (entrance) but the first 'N' had dropped leaving 'EIGANG' (line 15). This leads the three adolescents to a brief, fast and effective word play, which actually cannot be adequately represented by the transcript above (or by any other transcript). The sequence from line 15 to line 31 or 32 respectively is fully dedicated to the polyfunctionality and to the associations of the truncated presyllable 'Ei' which in German of course means 'egg' and which is homophonous with the Turkish noun 'ay' (moon, month) or – if extended by the Turkish vowel [i] – with 'bear' (*ayı*).

If the adolescents alternate languages they do it in a way which seems – as we have seen in the above examples – to have no restrictions in terms of adding Turkish suffixes to German words (not vice versa, however). This means that for the word play above all kinds of German–Turkish combinations have to be taken into account. Thus a German 'Eigang' (egg walk) may also be thought of as a German-Turkish 'ay Gang', a combination of 'moon' or 'month' with 'Gang' (walk, corridor, course (of a meal)).

It is probably because this phrase can be understood in so many ways that Kamil asks 'Nerede bunun ayı/Ei-i' (line 18 and line 20), to which Mehmet reacts with a laughter and which leads Kamil to the variant: 'Ay/Ei Gäng' (line 22). Kamil thus transforms 'Gang' into 'Gäng', but the German orthography does not show that Kamils pronunciation is indeed [aɪgæŋ] bringing a third language, i.e. English or American, into play. At this point Uğur, who has been teased before, enters the play as well (line 24), though it's not clear whether his contribution is one of participation or one of checking. Also Mehmet, who had started the play, offers another variant (lines 25 and 26): Mehmet pronounces the complete German EINGANG now with a strong draw as if it there were three instead of two syllables. This is also an interesting parallel to Uğur's alleged epenthetic pronunciation (line 9,) in that Mehmet inserts an additional vowel between the semivowelised [y] and the reinserted [n] thus pronouncing it in a very Turkish way as *{ay/Ei}-yin-gang*. Is this an allusion to Uğur's use of the stigmatised epenthetic form? Mehmet continues by returning to Kamil's Anglo-American variant, caricaturing the 'heavy accent' of a German-speaking American: [an gein svai gein] (line 26). The intonation pattern is roughly like that: ~ ^ ~ ^ . At the same time Mehmet's voice goes one pitch up. This variant derivates the verb 'gehen' from 'Gang'. On the paradigmatic level 'ein' is substituted by 'zwei'. 'Ein gehen' or 'eingehen', on which 'ein geyn' is based, is a proper German verb (construction) with different meanings. 'Zwei gehen', on the other hand, makes only sense as 'two (persons etc.) go'. It is, however, the parallelism that counts which Kamil reconverts into the nominal forms 'Eingang (+) Zweigang' (line 28). Uğur enters the game now with a new version in that he brings the 'bear' (*ayı*)

into play (line 27) using a full fledged Turkish genitive construction ‘the bear its walk’ (*ayı- GEN Gang-POSS. → ayı-n-in Gang-t*). Uğur’s bear-version, however, is not elaborated upon. Rather, Uğur adapts to Kamil’s ‘Eingang (+) Zweigang’ to which he adds ‘Weitergang’ or ‘zweiter Gang’ respectively (line 31). And as if ‘Weitergang’ should be taken literally, Mehmet opens up a new subject (line 33).

Obviously, the language play has reached its end here. And indeed the last two contributions were fully in German, presenting real existing words, far enough away from the initial word. In Table 1, the word play, which lasted only a few seconds is represented in a kind of overview just by enumerating its various stages.

(E-8)

Table 1 ‘Gang-ster’

| | |
|-----------|---|
| (line 15) | Ei gang |
| (line 16) | {Ei/Ay}Gang |
| (line 17) | Ei{n}gang |
| (line 18) | {ayı / Ei-t} |
| (line 20) | {ayı / Ei-t} |
| (line 22) | {Ay/Ei-Gäng / Ei-Gäng} ((engl.? [aɪ gæŋ])) |
| (line 24) | {ayı / Ei-t} |
| (line 25) | *ay yin gang* |
| (line 26) | ay{t}gang |
| (line 24) | #((amer. accent)) ein geyn zwei geyn# (([aɪn geɪn svaɪ geɪn]; ~^ ~^)) |
| (line 27) | ayının Gang-t |
| (line 28) | Eingang (+) Zweigang |
| (line 31) | {Weitergang / zweiter Gang} |

It is quite normal for children and adolescents to play with language, testing it and turning words upside down. That Mehmet, Kamil and Uğur do this in two languages, that they extract and exploit the language material and the ambiguities to play with from two languages is certainly the privilege of bilinguals. Mehmet, Kamil and Uğur go to secondary school. Their educational record is not brilliant. Pupils like them are very often regarded as semilingual or as defective bilinguals – these are the terms used within the school’s institutional discourse. However, we also find a high degree of language awareness expressed, for example, through the episode of stigmatising Uğur’s epenthetic pronunciation or the caricaturing of the American accent, not forgetting the missing ‘n’ of ‘Eingang’ that served as the immediate cause of the play. All this reflects their normative awareness of language.

Part of the play is on the word derivations, conversions, paradigmatic substitutions, parallelisms and continuous ambiguities that are borne out of the two languages’ in-betweenness, thus fully exploiting the potentials of bilingualism.

Playing in-between the two (and sometimes more) languages (or codes) is not infrequent. Mehmet and Kamil do it quite often, as do other adolescent bilinguals. At one point there is a kind of extempore composition triggered by talking about a football coach named 'Wolfgang', which is presented in Table 2 (without the context in which it is embedded).

(E-9)

Table 2 'Wolfgang'

| |
|---|
| Wolfgang <i>adı</i> Wolfgang [Wolfgang <i>his name is</i> Wolfgang] |
| Wolfgang Wolf'un <i>oğlu</i> Molf [Wolfgang wolf <i>his son</i> molf] |
| Wolfgang Wolf'un <i>oğlu</i> Molfgang [Wolfgang wolf <i>his son</i> Molfgang] |
| Wolfgang Wolf'un <i>oğlu</i> in Wolfsburg [Wolfgang wolf <i>his son</i> in Wolfsburg] ¹¹ |
| Adam <i>dreimal</i> Wolf <i>oldu</i> Doppelwolf [The man <i>was</i> three times wolf doublewolf] |
| Ama Wolfsburg'da <i>oynuyor</i> [But he plays in Wolfsburg] |
| Wolfgang <i>oynuyor</i> ama wo wo [Wolfgang plays but where where] |

Besides the alliterative play with the letter 'o' it is also the bilabial initial sound 'm' (Wolf'un *oğlu* molf) which is conspicuous here. This 'm'- alternation is a typical Turkish etcetera-form: cf. *Hasan Masan* meaning Hasan and his friends – a pattern used here in an expressive-poetic function.

To give another, less extensive, example: at one point, whilst talking about fights between football fans, the adolescents use an imaginary gun and rhythmically shoot around, which is supported by a Turkish counting-out rhyme which is further accompanied by clapping hands: '*Bir sana bi hava / bir sana bi hava*' ('One for you, one into the air / one for you, one into the air'), which then was altered to '*Hava Ana*', to 'Mother Eve', which then profanely ends as a German '*Havanna Zigarre*' (*Havana cigar*).

This kind of language performance in two languages often displays extempore poetry. In doing so, the performers not only make use of their bilingualism but also exploit its possibilities for boundary crossing by fusing and blending words, as well as expressive mechanisms (such as the bilabial etcetera-marker). The bilingual language players thus display quite a high normative awareness of language and its potentials, even of word order processes. In a situation where standards of bilingual language use and linguistic creativity were assessed, speakers such as these would be thought to have a high level of linguistic reflection and consciousness.

Besides vernacular and dialectal elements, stylised elements of *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* (guest worker German, immigrants' Pidgin-German) are integrated into the performances. Stylised speech has been well researched by Rampton as one of the 'crossing' phenomena in language ('stylized Asian English', cf. Rampton, 1995). Stylised German is the – mostly exaggerated – imitation of the first generation migrants' accent when speaking German. Uğur's alleged pronunciation of 'stirb' as 'sitr̩b' in (E-7) is a typical instance of this accent.

Stylisations as mimicry

The use of *Gastarbeiterdeutsch*, or marked elements of it (emblems), as part of the mixed language repertoire plays an important role in itself. As a matter of fact, it functions as a kind of intertextual quotation. On the one hand, this stylised variety is a copy or quotation of a particular language variety as it was, and still is, spoken by the parent generation of migrants; on the other hand, it is also an imitation of majority society's ascriptions *vis-à-vis* migrants in general (as is used in foreigner talk, in caricature, comedy shows and elsewhere). During the 40 years of postwar immigration to Germany (at least since its visibility has called for political measures) proper command of German has become the *tertium comparationis* for integration as defined by majority society, and non-compliance to this demand can at any time be made the rationale for distinction and discrimination (cf. Hinnenkamp, 1980, 1990). When using a mixed language, however, it is no more than a quotation and a stylistic ingredient to play with. At the same time, and it is important to emphasise this, it is not their authentic language as a category of speakers but represents re-appropriation by mimicry.

This multiple role is nicely exemplified in Excerpt 10. Mehmet (Me) is speaking again, this time sitting together with a friend in his room listening to techno music. Mehmet's little niece and nephew are playing on the floor. In the background one can sometimes hear the voice of Mehmet's mother. When she enters the room the following minor dialogue develops between mother (Mo) and son:

(E-10) Transcript 'Wie geht's (How are you?)

- 1 **Mo:** ((calling her grandchild)): NEREDESİN GI:::Z?
Where are you, girl?
- 2 ((1 sec.))
- 3 **Mo:** ((enters the room; directed towards her son)):
WIE GE:::ST?
How are you?
- 4 **Me:** NIX GU:AT
No good
- 5 **Mo:** NIX GU:AT?
No good?
- 6 **Mo:** ((breathes deeply and picks up the child)) °hopala°

As we can see, Mehmet's mother does not approach her son in Turkish but in a loud and extremely exaggerated *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* way of speaking. Asking 'WIE GE:::ST?' is certainly not meant as a kind of welcoming remark towards her son or his friend. Both have been there all afternoon and have been in frequent contact with her. The question is not only marked by the metathesis of 'TS' to 'ST' (the Standard German form is 'Wie geht's') but in particular on the prosodic level by its loudness, the vowel lengthening and the high pitched voice. Mehmet responds in the same extreme and exaggerated way. 'NIX GU:AT' is an apt and adequate answer in tone and voice, and furthermore diphthongises the German [u:] in 'gut' (good) into 'guat', which is an exaggerated form of Bavarian dialect. Furthermore it contains the highly stigmatised negation particle 'nix'. 'Nix' is the passepartout negator in *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* and is also Bavarian. Phrases like 'nix

verstehen' (no understand) and 'nix deutsch sprechen' (no speak German) are caricature classics when ridiculing migrant speech. His mother's checking question terminates the sequence. She picks up the child and leaves the room. The isolation, the displaced topic and the conditional irrelevance of this three-turn-sequence strongly suggest a metaphorical intertextual language play between mother and son, in which the stylised form of *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* comes to fruition. This variety is omnipresent. Its figurative use even releases ritual clichés from rituality and topics from their thematic boundedness. Its function is purely phatic: a *We* that reassures itself of its own identity via an exaggerated and caricatured use of voices that are not their own (anymore) but which become re-appropriated in play, this time, however, stripped of any threatening connotations.

Discussion

Based on the self-characterisations of the migrant adolescent users of mixed language, I want to describe in particular its place in migratory history and immigrant society, and to locate it within the wider societal context of migratory discourse.

'Speaking mixed' – an active discourse in its own right

In the interviews which I conducted with the adolescents who switch and mix codes in the described ways, they described their way of talking as *gemischt sprechen* or *karışık konuşmak* (both meaning 'speaking mixed'); some limit their description to 'speaking half-German half-Turkish'. My informants in Augsburg refer to it quite metaphorically as *yarım yamalak konuşmak* which could be glossed as 'patchwork speaking'. But whichever way they label their way of speaking, there are two things that are crucial:

- (1) They have given this specific way of speaking an autonomous name. They thus distinguish between this and other varieties of language and even other languages. An internal differentiation according to the degree of switching and mixing does not exist.
- (2) The characterisation of this variety by its users always expresses an activity. It is not named by a noun such as 'mixed language' or 'patchwork language' but is always combined with *verba dicendi*-formulations such as German *sprechen* and *reden* or Turkish *konuşmak* (all meaning 'to speak'). That is, when they are 'speaking mixed' they are doing something very active.¹²

The relevance of this kind of activistic self-reference becomes clear in the background of how the language of their parents (and sometimes grandparents) was labelled. They spoke *Gastarbeiterdeutsch*. This characterisation of the language variety spoken by immigrants has even entered Hadumod Bußmann's German 'Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft' (Linguistic Dictionary), where we find the following entry: 'Gastarbeiterdeutsch is a pidgin variant which developed in Germany since the 1960s and 1970s and is characterized by paratactic sentence patterns, limited lexicon, little redundancy, deletion of article, preposition, conjunction and verbal inflection. All these features are generally occurring irrespective of the speaker's native language' (Bußmann, 1983: 157; 1990: 262f., my

translation). The name *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* is rooted not in the users themselves but in other-characterisation by, for example, wider society, the media and linguists. As we learn from the above entry it was not conspicuous because of its genesis in emergency multilingual language situations or in its supportive function in untutored processes of making oneself understood. Only its deficits are focused on here. The migrants' native languages have to be remembered as well: they did not play a prominent role in the linguistic discussion. Even if they did, they were of interest only insofar as they were responsible for learning inhibitions (negative transfers etc.). Also, the attempts of the next generation, called *Gastarbeiter-* or *Ausländerkinder* (migrant children, foreigner children), to get along in two languages (their parents' language and the German varieties) led to them being only too often denounced as 'semilingual' (cf. Hinnenkamp, 1990, 2000b).

None of these labels originated from the immigrant community themselves, but they were names given to them by majority society. In contrast to this, the generation of 'speaking mixed' has given this name to their language (variety) themselves, without being labelled so by others. Majority society, furthermore, is no longer the direct addressee of this language; all it provides is overhearers. When speaking to majority language monolinguals the speakers who mix have German at their disposal; with Turkish-speaking people they have Turkish, and among themselves the mixed variety. These are the general options. The patterns are 'monolinguality', 'bilinguality' or 'mixed language'.

Of course, reality does not fit such a clear-cut picture. It would be naïve to pretend that the options or choices selected in actual discourse follow a pattern. We find imbalances in language dominance, have to deal with incompetence and with emergency solutions in order to reach a communicative goal. The ways in which bilingual speakers deal with imbalances can be seen when within a group the more versatile speaker adjusts *vis-à-vis* a speaker who is less fluent in switching languages, by converging towards one's partner's preferred or stronger language, for example. Another recipient design in this respect is the doubling principle, repeating or paraphrasing the utterance (or part of it) in the other language. All of this can be found in the accident-account (E-4) and (E-5), where R repeatedly adjusts his mixing strategies towards his linguistically less versatile partner Y.

***Gemischt sprechen* and identity**

'Speaking mixed' is not simply one language option among many – it is also an expression of a particular identity within the migratory process. The adolescents who grow up under such polycultural and multilingual conditions are confronted with contradictory ideas of which kind of linguistic and cultural conduct are apt. If we fall back upon another of those often cited essentialisms within the migratory discourse, we might say that these adolescents' use of a 'split language' is analogous to the way in which they possess a 'split identity'. Hence, their mixed language can be seen as just another expression of their confusion between two languages, two cultures and two socialisations. This, of course, is extremely simplified if not wrong. It portrays language, culture and identity in a one-to-one relationship and operates on a basis of rigid essentialist concepts. Identity is regarded as a fixed and ready-made entity, like a suit which either fits or does not fit. The constitution of identity (or identities, I should say) is

a permanent process and communication plays an important part in it. One does not have a single identity but one operates, interacts and struggles with different identities. Its formation is a continuous debate with other people, with different social and societal demands (cf. Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). These identities are also borne out of boundary marking against majority society or against one's parent generation.

We find them transformed into 'acts of identity' (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1985), in communicative acts, in which an inventory of categories is used: how, for example, to deal with one's own and with others' typifications and ascriptions; how to claim, to confirm or mark off membership and affiliations; how to include oneself in and exclude oneself from groups and communities. Acts of identity make these and other categories of localising oneself individually or socially relevant. One's localisation is neither free of contradictions nor permanent and stable. It implies a permanent struggle between a chosen self and ascribed identities.

Gemischt sprechen is not only an expression of a transitional social identity. It does not simply juxtapose elements of different languages, but blends them, creates new compositions, hybrid forms and fills up a semantic room that was hitherto unoccupied and undefined. It mirrors an autonomous approach by way of language alternation, language mixing and appropriations from both linguistic communities and both 'cultures' (if we allow this simplification for a moment). In this sense *gemischt sprechen* represents an autonomous hybridolectal *We-code*. That is, code alternations do not correspond to alternations of metaphorical *We* versus *They*-affiliations along the lines of *Ingroup-Outgroup/We-Code-They-Code* (cf. Gumperz, 1982) but represent a *We-code* in its own right (see also Hinnenkamp, 2000a; Sebba & Wootton, 1998).

Hybridity, hybridolect and *gemischt sprechen*

Hybridity, hybridisation and hybridolect are terms to characterise the process of language mixing and code-oscillation as described and analysed above. The terminology itself is biologicistic (cf. e.g. Whinnom's, 1971, approach to contact languages). The new hybridity discourse within the humanities, however, has transmuted this concept into a critique of essentialist, heteronomous and dependential positions in theories of literature, culture, sociology and sociolinguistics. Popular theorems of colonial dependency and modernisation, as well as the installation of a concept of multiculturalism that is based on the fixation of oppositions in language, culture, identity and ethnicity, have been challenged by the deconstructive work of the hybridity discourse.¹³ In this respect it is only too obvious that the hybridity discourse also presents an apt frame for locating the discussion of the global motives for migrant adolescents' language mixing.

To use the notion of hybridity within the text sciences has a long tradition (cf. Bakhtin, 1981). In recent times it has particularly been established in the so-called postcolonial debate on literature and culture theory (cf. among many others García Canclini, 1992; Pratt, 1992; Young, 1995). Hybridity emphasises the – sometimes unexpected – blending of linguistic and cultural systems. Its main focus is oriented towards the *reactive* development of new linguistic, cultural and identity forms in conflict with majority society, hegemony and (ex) colonial

society. One breeding ground for such reactive forms is the urban multicultural society. The forms of language, culture and identity that have been developing there fit neither into the image of ethnic minorities in terms of ethnocultural folklore nor in terms of an integrative acculturation.

Conclusion

The adolescent actors who grow up in the polycultural and polylinguistic space of urban migration centres develop specific transitory forms and creations out of the pool of codes at their disposal. This *bricolage*-argument is well known. The bilingual and bilingually mixed conversations of migrant adolescents are not just code-switching in the sense of juxtaposing rules out of two languages and their local indexical functions. What we get is an autonomous hybrid code, oscillating between two languages, representing both languages, and, at the same time constituting something third, which they call *gemischt sprechen*, *karişık konuşmak*, *yarım yamalak konuşmak*, *kauderzanca* and the like – a linguistic code in its own right (also cf. Meeuwis & Blommaert, 1998; Swigart, 1992).

This mixed language functions like a mirror of the historical, social, cultural and linguistic conditions under which these adolescents grow up. Historically, the code is the critical response to the majority society's demands for integration. The demand is to be in good command of German and at the same time to be allowed to preserve one's Turkishness as an 'ethnic identity', which of course will then remain the last resort of discrimination and segregation. Sociolinguistically the adolescents react with an ingroup-language, a *We-Code*, which implies both deficit and competence, but first and foremost, however, difference and autonomy. The latter lead to exclusion, of the parent generation on the one hand, and of majority society on the other hand. Both, however, become re-integrated into an autonomous code which is made up by the 'donating languages' – to adapt a word from the beginnings of creole studies – but which are also distorted, caricatured and reinterpreted. At this point, the quote from Kobena Mercer (1988) that begins this paper will speak for itself.

Across a whole range of cultural forms there is a 'syncretic' dynamic which critically *appropriates* elements from the mastercodes of the dominant culture and 'creolises' them, disarticulating given signs and re-articulating their symbolic meaning otherwise. The subversive force of this hybridising tendency is most apparent at the level of language itself where creoles, patois and Black English decentre, destabilise and carnivalise the linguistic domination of 'English'. (Mercer, 1988: 57)

Mercer wrote this with respect to 'black film practice'. In a more general sense this pertains to all 'mastercodes', so that English could be substituted by other dominant languages or hegemonial codes. The hybridolect as used by the Turkish adolescents thus represents a kind of feedback effect to the 'mastercode', it constitutes a re-appropriation and re-contextualisation of a discourse that so far had been defined solely by others. In this respect the adolescents' mixed code with all its implications is part and parcel of the hybridity discourse.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Katherina Meng, Carol Pfaff and Normann Jørgensen for their critical and valuable comments. As usual, all responsibility is solely mine. The data that form the basis of my contribution were collected during a research project that was financially supported by the University of Augsburg.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Dr Volker Hinnenkamp, Fulda University of Applied Sciences, Intercultural Communication and European Studies (ICEUS), D-36039 Fulda, Germany (volker.hinnenkamp@sk.fh-fulda.de)

Notes

1. A word has to be said about ‘migrant adolescents’ in the German context (‘Migrantenjugendliche’). The adolescents whose language will be focused on in this essay are certainly no migrants themselves. The level of the German discussion, however, is that in the public discourse adolescents with an ethnic background (Turkish, Greek, Croatian, etc.) are still regarded (also by law) as ‘Ausländer’ (‘foreigners’) and as ‘Ausländerjugendliche’ (‘young/adolescent foreigners’ or ‘second’ or ‘third generation foreigners’). Regarding them as ‘immigrants’ or migrants is a progress that acknowledges at least their status being borne out of the migratory context (of their parents or grandparents). Furthermore, these adolescents have so far been mainly the object of this discourse, hardly the subject of it. This relationship is also reflected in the notion of ‘migrant’. Change in perception and acknowledgement comes slowly (cf. Terkessidis, 2000). It’s mainly the articulations of ‘migrant adolescents’ themselves that promote this change. This essay is dedicated to the further *de-objectification* of the migratory discourse and to the *respect of autonomous forms of expression*.
2. Special thanks to Tuna Döger and Ahmet Atasever for their support in getting the data. Most of the data were gathered in informal situations by one of the adolescents themselves, mostly during spare time activities. Not all participants of a taped conversation were thus informed beforehand. They were then asked afterwards if they agreed in using their data. They all agreed. Furthermore, they were very enthusiastic that interest was shown *vis-à-vis* their language. The participants were also asked for additional information about some personal data. With some of the adolescents, interviews were made about their usage of mixed language.
3. See my comment in Note 1 above.
4. Here we have to ask if H and E are still talking about the same subject: H is asking for a place which at the same time he rejects as already known. In this respect we have to deal with a misframing of contexts.
5. Particularly salient are periphrastic German-Turkish verb constructions with ‘*yapmak*’ or ‘*etmek*’ (to make, to do), which have been researched by other authors as well (e.g. Backus, 1992, 1996; Hayasi, 1999; Pfaff, 2000). Cf. instances such as (i) *Ötekini* nach dem ‘welches’ *einsetzen yaparsan*. [If you inserted the other after the ‘welches’ (which)]
(ii) *Langzeitig denken yapıyoruz*. [We think in long terms]
As we can see from these examples this construction requires the harmonisation of two grammars: in both cases the pronominal drop of ‘Du’ (you, tu) in (i) and ‘wir’ (we) in (ii) requires the continuation in the PRO DROP-language Turkish.
6. This is a genuine Turkish genitive construction: *bu*-GENITIVE SUFFIX *ay*/Ei-POSSESSIVE SUFFIX.
7. K’s pronunciation here is different: the German Umlaut ‘ä’ signifies that he says it with an English pronunciation, so the equivalent translation would be ‘gang’.

8. This construction is actually not translatable into English: The German verb 'eingehen' means primarily 'to die, to decay' and in another sense also 'to enter' (in relation to 'Eingang' – 'entrance'). Of course, the German prefix 'ein-' is identical to the number/indefinite article 'ein' (one, a). Thus, 'zwei gehen' with 'zwei' meaning 'two' is a parallel construction to 'ein gehen'. The meaning of this two verb construction is manifold: e.g. in guestworker pidgin 'one walk two walk'.
9. This is the parallel noun construction to line 26. However, the nouns do not correspond to the verbs. 'Weitergang' translated as 'continuation' could also be written 'weiter Gang' meaning 'wide corridor'.
10. Uğur's alleged realisation of 'stirb' does not only allude to the highly stigmatised pronunciation of Turk's 'Gastarbeiterdeutsch' ('guest workers'/immigrants' German) of inserting vowels between consonant clusters as a transfer from Turkish which has many more restrictions on consonant clusters than German. Secondly, the German [i] is furthermore relaxed into a Turkish centralised [I]. Thirdly, German dialectal features are lost. It also remains unclear, if alone Ugur's defective pronunciation is responsible for the laughter or if this is also due to a particular role constellation within the group.
11. 'Wolfsburg' is the German town of the Volkswagen motor works.
12. In the critical and antiethnicist movement of migrants other labels are used as well which partly have become popularised by the books of Feridun Zaimoglus (Zaimoglus, 1995, 1997, 1998). 'Kanak Sprak' based on the xenophobe invective 'Kanake' is one such label which formally and semantically has a wider extension than *gemischt sprechen* (cf. Zaimoglu's preface in 'Kanak Sprak'; also cf. Pfaff, 2003). 'Kanak Sprak' reflects and absorbs the negative ascriptions as much as it is an expression of new self-confidence and identity. But as it consists mainly of stylised and jargonised forms (and is not bilingual) it becomes easily majorised by non-ethnic jargon and comedy shows (cf. Keim & Androutsopoulos, 2000; Füglein, 2000).
13. On some earlier and highly enlightening treatises on this subject matter, cf. for example Hewitt, 1992; Le Page & Tabouret-Keller, 1982; see also Rampton's ethnographic work on language crossing (1995). Another aspect is the critique of institutionalised folklorisation of cultural and ethnic difference. Young (1995: 5) comments on this: 'the doctrine of multiculturalism encourages different groups to reify their individual and different identities at their most different, thus (...) encouraging extremist groups, who have become 'representative' because they have the most clearly discernibly different identity'.

References

- Androutsopoulos, J. and Hinnenkamp, V. (2001) Code-Switching in der bilingualen Chat-Kommunikation: ein explorativer Blick auf #hellas und #turks. In M. Beißwenger (ed.) *Chatkommunikation. Sprache, Interaktion, Sozialität & Identität in synchroner computervermittelter Kommunikation* (pp. 367–401). Stuttgart: Ibidem.
- Antaki, C. and Widdicombe, S. (1998) Identity as an achievement and as a tool. In C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe (eds) *Identity in Talk* (pp. 1–14). London: Sage.
- Auer, P. (1988) A conversation analytic approach to codeswitching and transfer. In M. Heller (ed.) *Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 187–213). Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Auer, P. (ed.) (1998a) *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Auer, P. (1998b) Introduction: *Bilingual Conversation* revisited. In *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity* (pp. 1–24). London/New York: Routledge.
- Auer, P. (1998c) From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *InLiSt* [Interaction and Linguistic Structures] 6. Freiburg im Breisgau.
- Backus, A. (1992) *Patterns of Language Mixing. A Study in Turkish-Dutch Bilingualism*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

- Backus, A. (1996) *Two in One. Bilingual Speech of Turkish Immigrants in the Netherlands*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) (orig. 1935) *The Dialogic Imagination. Four essays*. Austin: Texas University Press.
- Bußmann, H. (1983/1990) *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Kröner.
- Clarke, J. (1976) Style. In S. Hall and A. Jefferson (eds) *Resistance through Rituals. Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain*. London: Hutchinson.
- Eastman, C. (ed.) (1992) Codeswitching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13 (1/2).
- Füglein, R. (2001) Kanak Sprak. Eine ethnolinguistische Untersuchung eines Sprachphänomens im Deutschen. Unpublished paper, University of Bamberg.
- García Canclini, N. (1992) *Culturas Híbridas. Estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana.
- Gumperz, J.J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- Hayasi, T. (1999) Insertion of German verbal elements into Turkish discourse by Turkish-German bilingual speakers in Berlin. *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers (TULIP)* 18, 215–230 (in Japanese, summary in English).
- Hewitt, R. (1992) Language, youth and the destabilisation of ethnicity. In C. Palmgren, K. Lövgren and B. Göran (eds) *Ethnicity in Youth Culture* (pp. 27–42). Stockholm: Youth Culture at Stockholm University.
- Hinnenkamp, V. (1980) The refusal of second language learning in interethnic context. In H. Giles, P. Robinson and P.H. Smith (eds) *Language: Social Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 179–184). Oxford & New York: Pergamon.
- Hinnenkamp, V. (1989) *Interaktionale Soziolinguistik und Interkulturelle Kommunikation. Gesprächsmanagement zwischen Deutschen und Türken*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hinnenkamp, V. (1990) 'Gastarbeiterlinguistik' und die Ethnisierung der Gastarbeiter. In E. Dittich and F.-O. Radtke (eds) *Ethnizität. Wissenschaft und Minderheiten* (pp. 277–298). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Hinnenkamp, V. (2000a) 'Gemischt sprechen' von Migrantenjugendlichen als Ausdruck ihrer Identität. *Der Deutschunterricht* 5, 96–107.
- Hinnenkamp, V. (2000b) La comunicazione interculturale. Aspetti dei suoi sviluppi in Germania. In F. Ricci-Garotti and M. Rosanelli (eds) *Programmi di scambio con i paesi di lingua tedesca e dimensione interculturale* (pp. 128–143). Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Hinnenkamp, V. and Meng, K. (eds) (2003) *Sprachgrenzen überspringen. Sprachliche Hybridität und polykulturelles Selbstverständnis*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Kallmeyer, W., Tandoğan-Weidenhammer, D. and Keim, I. (2000) Deutsch-Türkisches. Sprache und kommunikativer Stil von Migranten. *Sprachreport* 3, 2–8.
- Keim, I. and Androutopoulos, J. (2000) Hey Lan, isch geb dir konkret Handy. Deutsch-türkische Mischsprache und Deutsch mit ausländischem Akzent: Wie Sprechweisen der Straße durch die Medien populär werden. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ)*, 26 January.
- Le Page, R.B. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1982) Models and stereotypes of ethnicity and of language. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 3 (3), 161–192.
- Le Page, R.B. and Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985) *Acts of Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meeuwis, M. and Blommaert, J. (1998) A monolectal view of code-switching: Layered code-switching among Zairians in Belgium. In P. Auer (ed.) *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity* (pp. 76–100). London/New York: Routledge.
- Mercer, K. (1988) Diaspora cultures and the dialogic imagination: The aesthetics of Black independent film in Britain. In M.B. Cham and C. Andrade-Watkins (eds) *Blackframes: Critical Perspectives on Black Independent Cinema* (pp. 50–61). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pfaff, C.W. (2000) Development and use of *et-* and *yap-* by Turkish/German bilingual children. In A. Göksel and C. Kerlake (eds) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages* (pp. 365–373). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

- Pfaff, C.W. (2003) 'Kanakan in Alemannistan': Feridun Zaimoglu's representation of migrant language. In *Sprachgrenzen überspringen. Sprachliche Hybridität und polykulturelles Selbstverständnis*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Pratt, M.L. (1992) *Imperial Eyes. Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rampton, B. (1995) *Crossing. Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London and New York: Longman.
- Sassen, S. (1996) *Migranten, Siedler, Flüchtlinge. Von der Massenauswanderung zur Festung Europa*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
- Sebba, M. and Wootton, A. (1998) We, they and identity: Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity* (pp. 262–289). London/New York: Routledge.
- Swigart, L. (1992) Two codes or one? The Insider's view and the description of codeswitching in Dakar. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13 (1/2), 83–102.
- Terkessidis, M. (2000) *Migranten*. Hamburg: Europäische Verlagsanstalt/Rotbuch.
- Whinnom, K. (1971) Linguistic hybridization and the 'special case' of pidgins and creoles. In D. Hymes (ed.) *The Pidginization and Creolization of Languages* (pp. 91–115). London and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, R.J.C. (1995) Hybridity and Diaspora. In R.J.C. Young *Colonial Desire. Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (pp. 1–54). London and New York: Routledge.
- Zaimoglu, F. (1995) *Kanak Sprak. 24 Misstöne vom Rande der Gesellschaft*. Hamburg: Rotbuch.
- Zaimoglu, F. (1997) *Abschaum. Die wahre Geschichte von Ertan Ongun*. Hamburg: Rotbuch.
- Zaimoglu, F. (1998) *Koppstoff. Kanaka Sprak vom Rande der Gesellschaft*. Hamburg: Rotbuch.

Appendix: Legend to Transcriptions

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| {?kommt} | doubtable reconstruction |
| {fährt /Pferd} | potential alternatives of hearing and interpreting |
| (...) | incomprehensible (with variable extension according to length) |
| (()) | commentary, e.g. ((1.5 sec.)), ((laughter)) |
| #((Com.)) dadada# | scope of commentary |
| wie- | abortion of utterance |
| sa:gt, sa:::gt | vowel lengthening, degree of lengthening |
| lanngsam, dasssss | holding of consonant, according to intensity |
| ein | assimilation of unstressed endings such as 'ein' instead of 'einen' |
| damit | stressed, emphasised |
| DAS | high volume |
| °da° | low volume |
| °°da°° | very low volume |
| *ach was* | slowly |
| >darüber< | fast |
| »darunter« | very fast |
| /ver/ste/hen | staccato/syllabic kind of speech |
| + | pause below one second |
| (+) | micropause |
| (h) | onset hesitation |
| = | fast connection |
| kom[men | |
| [da | overlap and point of overlap |
| <i>oğlum</i> | Turkish text in italics |