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ABSTRACT
This study investigated the family language policy of second-generation Turkish immigrant families in the Netherlands by exploring their language ideologies, practices, and management strategies. Using an ethnographic approach, data were collected through a set of observations and interviews with 20 families. Transcriptions of interviews and memos of observations were coded to derive the major strategies employed by parents regarding home language use. The findings show that, although Turkish maintenance is a very important part of the linguistic ideologies of the families studied, there is great diversity and complexity in their language practices and management strategies. All of the families focus their language planning activities around the educational achievement of their children. Therefore, the recommendations of educational institutions are very important in their language practices.
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Introduction
In this paper, we document the family language policy (FLP henceforth) of second-generation Turkish families in the Netherlands. Using an ethnographic approach, we explore parents’ construction of language ideologies, practices, and management strategies.

The Turkish community forms the largest minority group in the Netherlands (CBS 2017), and various studies have been conducted regarding their language practices thus far. Most research has concentrated on the Dutch language skills of Turkish children compared to their native Dutch speaking peers. While a limited amount of research has focused on bilingual skills (Aarts and Verhoeven 1999; Driessen and Merry 2011; Leseman 2000) very few studies have investigated first language skills (Aarssen 1996; Akoglu and Yagmur 2016; Bezcioglu-Goktolga 2016; Schaufeli 1992), home language environment (i.e. Scheele, Leseman, and Mayo 2010), or language maintenance, shift, and code-switching (i.e. Backus 1996; Doğruöz 2007; Eversteijn 2011; Yagmur 2016). There has been limited attention paid to Turkish acquisition in the home context (i.e. Aarts et al. 2016). In addition to all these studies, it is important to take sociocultural factors, such as community characteristics and mainstream policies, into consideration in order to understand language practices.

In the absence of institutional support for immigrant language education, ethnic community organisations and familial support become crucial agents of language maintenance. Families take responsibility for transmitting their heritage language to the next generations (Fishman 1991), otherwise it is bound to be lost (Fishman 2001). Earlier research on first-generation immigrants shows
that the Turkish community maintains the Turkish language and culture (for an overview see Backus 2013). However, there is no research on prevalent language practices among second-generation families. In this paper, utilising Spolsky’s (2004, 2007) language policy model of language ideology, practices, and management, we provide evidence regarding the language preferences of second-generation Turkish families in their interactions with their third-generation children.

In order to better contextualise our research, we provide the theoretical background of the FLP in the next section. Subsequently, we present a sociolinguistic profile of the Turkish community in the Netherlands so that the societal circumstances surrounding their language practices can be thoroughly analysed.

**Family language policy**

Language policy is the endeavour by an authority figure to change the linguistic activities of another (Spolsky and Shohamy 2000), aiming ‘to account for the regular choices made by individual speakers on the basis of patterns established in the speech community’ (Spolsky 2007, 1). In FLP, this endeavour is invested in the home context regarding language practices among family members (Curdt-Christiansen 2009). Language policy has three main components: ideology, practice, and management (Spolsky 2004). Language ideology is composed of beliefs about language, namely the use of minority and majority languages in the immigration context. Language practices are the acts of families in accordance with their ideologies, and language management involves deliberate efforts to influence language practices. As Schwartz (2010) describes, these deliberate language management efforts might be external (support of a sociolinguistic environment for intended language practices) or internal (control of the home language environment). Various factors shape language ideologies and contribute to the construction of FLP as described below.

**Construction of family language ideologies**

Both macro factors (e.g. the political and sociocultural environment) and micro factors (e.g. the home literacy environment, parents’ expectations) are driving forces in shaping FLP (Curdt-Christiansen 2009). Firstly, macro factors are known to influence FLP. In her research with Chinese families in Singapore, Curdt-Christiansen (2014) found that as the national policy values English at the educational and sociopolitical levels, Chinese parents were also inclined to accept the dominance of English in their families. Similarly, Luykx (2005) illustrated that school pressure on Quechua-speaking families in Bolivia to use only Spanish resulted in adaptations in their FLP. In the Netherlands, teaching of immigrant languages at primary and secondary schools between 1974 and 2004 (Yagmur 2005, 2009) was expected to create positive attitudes towards the use of these languages in immigrant families.

Micro dynamics within families are also undeniable in forming the FLP (Curdt-Christiansen 2009, 2016). To begin with, parents’ perceptions and practices play an important role in determining the attitudes of children towards the immigrant language as well as their bilingual development (De Houwer 2007; King and Fogle 2006; Leung and Úchikoshi 2012; Li 1999; Spolsky 2012). King and Fogle (2006) found, in their research with families who pursue Spanish-English bilingual FLP, that the parents’ own language learning experiences had an effect on how they shaped their linguistic interactions with their children. De Houwer (2007) illustrated, in her research with 1899 families in Belgium, that parents’ linguistic input determined whether or not their children became bilingual. On the other hand, although parents manage language activities up to a certain age, when their children start to socialise outside of the family, they bring the mainstream language home (Spolsky and Shohamy 2000) and resist the language practices of their parents (Caldas and Caron-Caldas 2002; Fogle 2013; Kayam and Hirsch 2012; Kopeliovich 2010, 2013; Luykx 2005; Palviainen and Boyd 2013). Caldas and Caron-Caldas (2002) revealed in their research that children tend to choose the language of the mainstream society as they grow up, despite their parents’ efforts to foster bilingualism.
In their research with Swedish-Finnish speaking families in Finland, Palviainen and Boyd (2013) showed that even preschool children can decide which parent should speak which language. In addition, by taking an active role in their children’s socialisation, mothers become crucial to language maintenance or shift within the family (Kayam and Hirsch 2012; Nakamura 2016; Tuominen 1999). Okita (2002) asserts that mothers play an important role in helping their children adjust to the school environment and the majority language as well as in promoting the home language.

De Houwer (1999) remarks that learning about parents’ beliefs and linguistic interactions have implications for children’s language development. For instance, in her research with indigenous Ecuadorian families, King (2001) found that children do not develop bilingual skills but rather choose Spanish alone because their parents believe that speaking both languages at home will inhibit their children’s learning. Regarding academic achievement, in his research with 108 Hispanic children whose parents choose between Spanish and English, Dolson (1985) found that children who use Spanish in the home context do much better than the monolingual-oriented group in various tests in school subjects. Regarding the teachers’ point of view, Huss-Keeler (1997) revealed in her one-year ethnographic research within a British multi-ethnic school that parents are actually very interested in adopting teachers’ suggestions for language practices in their family.

In summary, it is not easy for minority parents to decide what is best for their children, as they must pay attention to the expectations of mainstream society as well as their own language and culture (Curdt-Christiansen 2013). At this point, FLP research provides valuable insights into the interdependence between FLP and family relationships, children’s language development and school achievement (Fogle and King 2013; King and Fogle 2006). Given the theoretical framework of FLP and FLP research in the immigrant context, in the following section we provide information on the Turkish community in the Netherlands so as to understand the sociolinguistic factors at work in this field.

Profile of the Turkish community in the Netherlands

The history of the Turkish community in the Netherlands dates back to the late 1960s. The first generation emigrated from rural areas as guest workers (Backus 2013). However, increasing economic opportunities resulted in these immigrants bringing their family members from Turkey and creating a new community in this host country. Today, the Netherlands hosts around 400,000 Turkish immigrants (CBS 2017).

The first-generation Turkish immigrants lacked the necessary Dutch skills; therefore, their social and linguistic contacts were mainly within the Turkish group (Smets and Kreuk 2008). They lived in Turkish-dominated neighbourhoods and usually worked with other Turkish immigrants. Their education level was mainly primary school level or less (Crul and Doomernik 2003), which limited their access to Dutch classes. Due to the perceived temporary nature of being a guest worker, they did not put much emphasis on Dutch education for their children (Akgündüz 2007; Yılmaz and Schmid 2015). Similarly, until the late 1990s, the Dutch government did not emphasise their linguistic integration. Among other reasons, the disregard for immigrant children in mainstream education resulted in low levels of placement in higher secondary education over the years. Having linguistic input in Turkish at home and Dutch at school, these children could be identified as bilingual. However, like their parents, they were mostly from low socio-economic backgrounds with a lack of rich and elaborate linguistic input from their parents (Leseman and van den Boom 1999). Given all of these factors, they tended to fall behind their peers in education (Aarts and Verhoeven 1999; Leseman 2000; Verhallen and Schoonen 1998). Considering the role of parents in children’s school achievement, and given that second-generation families are an under-researched group, a main question arises regarding how second-generation families, who were raised as bilingual by monolingual parents, shape their home language interaction with their third-generation children.

The Turkish community is known to maintain their home language to a certain extent (Eversteijn 2011; Extra and Yagmur 2010). Children are primarily exposed to Turkish at home until they reach school age (Leseman 2000). Based on earlier research (Backus 2013; Böcker 1994; Eversteijn 2011;
Extra and Yagmur (2010; Yagmur 2009), we can say there are several factors that contribute to language maintenance among Turkish speakers in the Netherlands, such as easy access to Turkish media, holidays in Turkey, life partners from Turkey, high numbers of Turkish organisations, and segregation from the mainstream community. Given the strong in-group orientation, it is expected that even third-generation immigrants have some competence in Turkish. Nevertheless, the language maintenance efforts of a minority group do not operate in a vacuum and are impacted by the policies of the larger context. The following section describes the language policies of the Netherlands.

**Dutch policies on minority languages**

From the institutional point of view, there has been a shift away from a pluralistic approach to assimilation in the Netherlands (Driessen and Merry 2011; Vasta 2007). Initially, immigrant languages were taught in schools to improve home language skills and support Dutch. This practice began in 1974 in primary schools under the title ‘Education in One’s Own Language and Culture’. In 2004, these courses were abolished, with the idea being that they contradicted the policy of integration of minority children (Extra and Yagmur 2006). This led to the notion that, if there is to be integration, it is the minorities’ responsibility (Driessen and Merry 2011; Vasta 2007). Consequently, some teachers suggest parents speak the mainstream language in their daily lives (Stevens 2008). In this way, only the Dutch language is valued to be successful in Dutch society (Rijkschroeff et al. 2005). Currently, the teaching of minority languages is mainly limited to local activities at mosques or private organisations during extracurricular hours.

When immigrant children are forced to embrace only the mainstream norms and language, their academic achievement is negatively affected (Levin and Shohamy 2012). Levin and Shohamy (2012) noted that importance of understanding linguistic interactions and cultural characteristics of children in the home context may impact a child’s school performance. Huss-Keeler (1997) concluded in her research that teachers were able to understand the immigrant parents’ perspectives only after they saw what was actually going on in the families. In this respect, understanding the language interactions among family members, their beliefs and their efforts regarding home language practices can be achieved through a detailed study of the family (King, Fogle, and Logan-Terry 2008). A study of the FLP of the immigrant Turkish community in the Netherlands will increase the understanding of such families’ interactions with their children by showing actual ideologies and practices, while also offering new insights to provide better educational opportunities for children.

**The present study**

In this study, to reveal the FLP of second-generation Turkish families, we addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the language ideologies of second-generation Turkish families in the Netherlands?
2. What factors shape their language ideologies?
3. How do these families put their family language ideologies into practice?
4. How do these families manage their family language practices?

**Participants**

The target population of the study was second-generation Turkish families with children who were in the early years of primary school. For the accessible population, a purposive sampling method was used (Fraenkel and Wallen 2006). Participants were selected based on the following criteria: both parents had to be Turkish, at least one parent had to have been born in or moved to the Netherlands before school age, and the families had to have at least one child in the early years of primary school education.
Participants were recruited through contacting schools, prominent Turks in the area, and posts on social media. Of the 20 families recruited, five families included parents who were both born in the Netherlands. For the remaining 15 families, one parent was either born in the Netherlands or immigrated to the Netherlands before school age. The spouses of these parents were first-generation immigrants, who came to the Netherlands through marriage. The selection criteria may require further explanation to clarify our definition of second-generation families. Firstly, in this study we classified participants who moved to the Netherlands before reaching school age as second generation because their parents had already lived in the Netherlands before their children were born, and the mothers had simply delivered their babies in Turkey in order to receive maternal support for child-rearing. Secondly, although both parents should be the children of first-generation immigrants in order to be classified as second-generation, it was quite a challenge to find 20 families who satisfied this criterion, as most Turkish people in the Netherlands select their life partners from Turkey (Böcker 1994; Lucassen and Laarman 2009; Yagmur 2010), and this tradition continues among second-generation Turks (Yagmur 2015).

Table 1 presents the ages, levels of education, occupations and generations of the family members.

Data collection procedures

Data were collected through observations and semi-structured in-depth interviews. Each observation took between one and three hours. Due to the after-school schedules of the children, the frequency of the observations was not strict, but each family was visited on average once every three weeks, and at least five visits were made over the span of 15 weeks. The first researcher conducted visits to families for in- and out-of-home activities, and collected data focusing on linguistic interactions between parents, children, and relevant others.

Observations were audio-recorded and partially transcribed. The length of the recordings varied between one and three hours. We collected a total of 102 hours of recordings from 20 families. We based the partial transcriptions on natural conversations, mostly revolving around interactions between the child and relevant others. The first researcher noted these moments during observations (by checking the minutes) and transcribed the relevant parts of the audio. Besides the first researcher wrote memos after each observation to keep track of recurrent themes and emergent ideas. These memos helped the researchers to collect detailed data for the following observations. Recurrent themes and ideas were utilised to prepare the interview questions. After two experts reviewed the interview protocol, it was piloted with three key informants, two of whom not being involved in the study but satisfying the participant selection criteria, and one of whom being a participant mother who was actively involved in the research process. After the interview protocol was finalised, by reaching the end of the observation period, the first researcher conducted interviews with the mothers and fathers separately. The interview process included questions about the participants’ backgrounds, school lives, and ideologies regarding Turkish and Dutch, language activities at home and expectations regarding their children’s language development, as well as miscellaneous questions about topics such as contact with the homeland and the family’s future in the mainstream country. The interviews were conducted with 20 mothers and 15 fathers, and analysed according to the grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss 1967). If further explanation was needed, subsequent visits were arranged with the participants to address any follow-up questions. The flexibility of strategies for collecting and analysing data in grounded theory (Charmaz 2003) allowed the researchers to obtain comprehensive details.

Data analysis

The analysis of data started from the very beginning of data collection (Charmaz 2003). The interactions were recorded during the observations. Then, they were partially transcribed, memos were
Table 1. Age, generation, level of education and occupation distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family number</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Generation(^a)</th>
<th>Education(^b)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Generation(^a)</th>
<th>Education(^b)</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Children's age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Recruitment agent</td>
<td>7, 9, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pharmacy technician</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>School principal</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Furniture store owner</td>
<td>5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>6, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>3, 6, 9, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>6, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>3, 7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>3, 7, 16, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>6, 20, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recruitment agent</td>
<td>6, 14, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>5, 9, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6, 15, 17, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>7, 7, 9, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nurse/DJ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6 months, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Own car gallery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Farm worker</td>
<td>6 months, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Generation: 1st = first-generation – informants who moved to the Netherlands through marriage, 2nd = second-generation – informants who were born in the Netherlands or moved to the Netherlands before school age.

\(^b\)Level of Education was coded according to International Standard Classification of Education – ISCED 2011 (UIS 2012). 1 = lower education, 2 = lower secondary education, 3 = higher secondary education, 4 = higher education.
written, and recurrent themes arising during observations and interviews were noted and followed up in subsequent observations (Charmaz 1990).

The memos and transcriptions were carefully studied. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and coded according to the grounded theory approach (Charmaz 1990, 2003). The coding process started with initial coding, meaning that each utterance was given a code separating it into its smallest meaningful units. Then, the main categories and subcategories emerged – such as the background of the informant, their opinions regarding language choices and the language management strategies – and the initial codes were condensed under these categories. At the end, the most frequent and relevant codes were selected and numbered.

Since the interviews were conducted in Turkish, the responses have been translated as accurately as possible. Pseudonyms and abbreviations (e.g. F1M stands for FamilyOneMother, and F1F stands for FamilyOneFather) have been used in the findings section.

**Findings**

This section includes our findings on parental ideologies regarding language, the individual, and societal factors behind language ideologies, actual language practices, and language management strategies in the studied families.

**Language ideologies of parents**

Although the families follow a similar path regarding an emphasis on Turkish maintenance, they have diverse patterns regarding their language ideologies and practices.

**Reasons for language choices**

The presence of Turkish language and culture in the families was recognised from the outset. Turkish television channels, food from Turkish markets and Turkish ringtones on mobile phones, along with cultural habits, such as mothers’ visits to one another’s homes and fathers’ gatherings at coffee houses were very common in these families. The interviews align with these patterns. The studied parents all agreed that Turkish is maintained at home for several reasons (Table 2).

Preserving the Turkish identity was the most frequently mentioned reason for the use of Turkish in the home. As one mother stated ‘We are Turkish. What does it mean to be Turkish if the child does not speak a word of Turkish?’ (F14M). Most of the participants related language to their ethnic identification. Similarly, contact with Turkey and Turkish people in the Netherlands, the possibility of back migration, the importance of Turkish for better learning of the Dutch language, and the preservation of the mother tongue, Turkish culture, and religion were all presented as important reasons.

The parents’ expectations for their children’s Turkish proficiency varied. Twenty-six parents agreed that children should acquire Turkish before learning Dutch. However, only one parent desired that her children’s Turkish skills remain better than their Dutch when they grow up. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The reasons for Turkish language maintenance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>F (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To preserve Turkish identity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To preserve mother tongue</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain contact with people in Turkey</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The possibility of back-immigration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn Dutch and other languages better</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To preserve Turkish culture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To contact the Turkish in the Netherlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To preserve religion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
majority of the parents \( (n = 29) \) expected their children to possess both language skills equally, and six (17%) parents expressed the need for better Dutch skills in the future. There was one main reason for parents’ Dutch preferences and that was their children’s education and welfare. Parents wished for their children to become successful at school and have better career prospects. One mother (F1M) explained this point as follows: ‘I want my children to be successful. I tell my older son to speak Dutch, interact with Dutch friends, go out with them so that he they adapts to Dutch society and become successful in life.’ Another mother (F15M) asserted ‘My children are successful at school as we speak Dutch. Otherwise, they are one step behind. I don’t want this. When they are successful at school, they can find better jobs in the future.’ The opinion expressed here is highly congruent with the mainstream public discourse in the Netherlands, which claims that immigrant parents should speak Dutch with their children so that children can be more successful at school. From the parents’ side, while the reason for using Turkish was maintenance of the culture, Dutch was used to promote school and career success for children.

**Construction of family language ideologies**

The parents both want to maintain their own identity and adapt their children to Dutch society. Several individual and societal factors have an impact on their language ideologies.

The parents’ own language experiences are one of the individual factors. How they raised their first child had the greatest impact on the current language ideologies. One mother (F17M), with a 15-year-old daughter and a six-year-old son, mentioned that she spoke mostly Dutch to her daughter when she was little, but now she has limited skills in Dutch and Turkish. She admitted ‘… I know Gizem’s Turkish is very bad, but Akm is still learning (Turkish), so I told myself not to make the same mistake, because if he has good Turkish, he can form better Dutch sentences.’ Apparently, she currently believes that having a good basis in Turkish facilitates the acquisition of Dutch. Likewise, parents’ own language learning experiences affect their ideology:

We all (siblings) neither went to day care nor learnt a word of Dutch until we were four. But we learnt Turkish very well from our parents until we were four. Then we could easily learn Dutch. I thought of this and wanted to apply this to my children as well. (F3M)

Further, societal factors have a great influence on family language ideologies. The participant families are primarily in contact with other Turkish people. One father described the situation as follows: ‘Dutch? No, I have only colleagues from work. Sometimes one has a baby, or the managers invite everyone for dinner, then we meet. But otherwise, I do not have any Dutch friends’ (F2F). Apparently, this pattern is consistent throughout the third-generation, as another father added ‘I have contact only with Turkish people. I see that it is the same for my son. He has friends from Iran, Somali, but no native Dutch’ (F8F). When asked about the reasons for this, neither father had a clear answer. For them, it may be natural distance due to cultural differences, or has become their own preference after several failed attempts to establish contact with Dutch natives.

The family’s neighbourhood also affects language choices. Families living in smaller towns described the difference between the effects small towns and cities on their language preferences. One father who lives in a town with a population of 12,000 expressed his disappointment that when they speak Turkish outside, Dutch people just stare at them and they feel pressure to speak Dutch (F10F). Another father, who lives in a city with a population of 37,500 explained:

People who live here are very different from people living in the larger cities and they are a bit rude. When I pronounce a Dutch word incorrectly, they just ask again although they understand what I say. Then I get embarrassed and turn red in the face as I know they will laugh at me. Then I just do not prefer to speak Dutch at all. (F5F)

In this example, the societal pressure explicitly affects family members’ language use and socialisation inside and outside home. There are other extralinguistic factors that are determinants in this sense. Schools are the main institutions which influence parents when they are forming their
language ideologies. One parent (F9F) said there are schools that consider ‘children who do not speak Dutch as stupid, so they just impose Dutch on children and families’. Children develop positive attitudes towards the language that is recognised outside the home, which may result in undervaluing the home language.

On the other hand, teachers’ recognition of the home language may reinforce parents’ ideology regarding the maintenance of Turkish. A mother (F20M) explained how they feel respected by teachers’ use of few Turkish words:

We are mostly Turks at school. Our teachers, Mr. Johan and Mrs. Carola, learnt a bit of Turkish to communicate with us. They say ‘merhaba, însallah’ [hello, hopefully] and we really like it. This is respect for us, and we respect them more in return.

In addition, healthcare centres encourage the use of the mother tongue at home. One father recounted ‘When our children were born, we went to the healthcare centre, and there they told us to speak our own language first because the better children acquire their own language, the better they learn a second language’ (F2F).

The same pattern is noticed with speech therapists who make home visits to children needing special assistance for language development. A mother (F16M) described her experience with the speech therapist as follows:

I was told at school by the teacher that I should speak Dutch while doing school activities with my child. Then a speech therapist came home and we started to play a game. My child was speaking Turkish and I was translating. Then the therapist told me that I did not need to, but I should let him speak Turkish. She said speaking the mother tongue would encourage him to finish the task.

In this sense, parents’ language ideologies are impacted by various factors including personal experiences, societal expectations and beliefs about the role of Turkish in learning Dutch.

**Language practices in the family**

The language practices of Turkish families are determined by the interlocutors, the context of conversations and the actual language preferences of family members.

Firstly, the overall impression is that parents speak Turkish to each other to a great extent; however, when children get into the conversation, there is an inevitable shift to Dutch. An example of such a conversation with one family (F5M; F5F,) is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Şevki şu balıklara bi akvaryum alalım. (Turkish)</td>
<td>Şevki, we shall buy an aquarium for the fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Benim zamanım mi var? (Turkish)</td>
<td>Do I have time (for this)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Ja, ik wil een aquarium. (Dutch)</td>
<td>Yes, I want an aquarium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Ja, canım! (Dutch and Turkish mixed)</td>
<td>Yes, sweetie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the child joining in the conversation changes the language of the conversation from Turkish to Dutch, and the mother also switches (described as the code-switching parental discourse strategy by Lanza 2004). Despite their tendency to speak Dutch, if children realise an interlocutor does not speak Dutch, it is easy for them to maintain the conversation in Turkish. In one of the observations (F1M), two siblings (9 and 11-year-old boys) were playing a game on their tablet and speaking Dutch. When their grandmother came in, the children just switched to Turkish smoothly and explained the game to their grandmother. From then on, they spoke Turkish until the grandmother left the room.

Language practices also vary depending on the language preferences of the family members. During the interviews, 21 (60%) participants reported that they prefer to speak only or mostly Turkish within the family. However, there is a shift towards Dutch in children’s language preferences.
Specifically, 26 (74%) of the participants agreed that, although they can interact in Turkish, children mostly or exclusively prefer Dutch, especially in interaction with their siblings. One mother (F15M) mentioned that her children can understand and speak Turkish, but they just do not prefer it and answer their parents back in Dutch 'Ik spreek geen Turks [I don’t speak any Turkish].'

Similarly, the context of the conversation changes the language used. A ‘consistent Turkish’ speaking family (F2) switches to Dutch to draw their son’s attention to the school work. While working on an activity book, the mother and the six-year-old son interact as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Son</th>
<th>Ama anne bunu yapmak istemiyorum! Tablet oynamak istiyorum! (Turkish) [But, mom, I don’t want to do this! I want to play on the tablet!]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Kijkes! Welke kleur moet jij hier? (Dutch) [Look! What colour do you have to choose here?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Geel! (Dutch) [Yellow!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Ja! Sonra oynayabilirsin. (Dutch and Turkish mixed) [Yes! Later you can play games on the tablet.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, a ‘consistent Dutch’ speaking family shifts to Turkish when the conversation is about religious activities. A mother (F18), while talking to her husband in Dutch on the phone about when he would come home, switches to Turkish and says ‘İyi tamam ben de namazımı kılarm o arada [Ok, good! Then I will perform salaat meanwhile].’

Overall, the language preferences of family members, the context, and conversational interlocutors account for language practices within the families.

**Language management strategies**

Contrary to language ideologies and practices, when it comes to language management practices, there are differences between the first and second generation, as well as between parents of different levels of education. While higher-educated, second-generation parents are confident and equally involved in both Turkish and Dutch management practices in the family, Dutch management activities are the primary focus of first-generation parents, especially mothers with a lower educational background. In addition, both groups prefer to receive external support for Dutch management activities (e.g. a reading tutor or extra Dutch lessons).

Except for one family, all of the families are involved in language management activities. Turkish and Dutch management strategies are presented below.

**Turkish management activities**

Parents mainly support the use of only Turkish until children are four, the age at which they start school. Apart from everyday language use, they consciously speak only Turkish to younger children, and even correct themselves when they use a Dutch word in Turkish. Almost half of the parents (n = 17, 49%) expressed their efforts to speak only Turkish to their children before school age. The parents explain this as ‘We did our best to speak only Turkish in the beginning … ’ (F19M) and ‘We tried to speak as much Turkish as possible until he started school’ (F17F).

Besides, in 11 families out of 20, parents are involved in other language management activities in addition to the conscious use of only Turkish until school age. Parents are involved in teaching their children how to read and write in Turkish (n = 7, 20%), initiating the use of standard Turkish (n = 6, 17%), warning their children when they mix Dutch and Turkish (n = 5, 14%), reading books in Turkish (n = 4, 11%), watching television programmes in Turkish (n = 3, 8.5%), and sending their children to extra Turkish lessons (n = 2, 6%). Except for Turkish lessons, all of these management activities are practised at home.

Two recurrent management activities were observed in the families. One regards the correction of children when they mix Dutch words into Turkish conversations. The conversation below was recorded in one of the families (F11M):
The second strategy regards correcting pronunciation and directing children in standard Turkish use. For instance, when her son says ‘oynayak mı? [Shall we play?, regional accent]’, F12M repeatedly corrects as ‘oynayal mı? [Shall we play?, standard speech]’ in standard Turkish.

**Dutch management activities**

Parents in the current study also have strategies for managing children’s exposure to Dutch. These strategies include watching television programmes in Dutch (n = 9, 26%), sending their children to after-school activities (n = 8, 23%), reading Dutch books (n = 7, 20%), teaching basic Dutch words before the child reaches school age (n = 6, 17%), and providing extra Dutch lessons (n = 5, 14%). One family (F6M; F6F) had the daily habit of watching *Jeugdjournaal* (a news broadcast for children) every evening. During one of the observations, as the programme started, the six-year-old daughter called her brother and parents, and they watched the news together. Then, they started to discuss the news in Dutch. The father (F6) described this as follows: ‘*Jeugdjournaal* is a good habit we have now. The children learn the news and practice Dutch at their level’.

Overall, on the basis of the observations and interviews, the majority of the Turkish management activities for Turkish are implemented within the home context. In addition, besides own activities at home, Dutch management activities are enhanced through external actors.

**Discussion and conclusion**

On the basis of the findings of this study, we can see that the diversity and complexity of the factors within the family and society makes it impossible to generalise families as having only one set of language policies. Nevertheless, similar patterns can be observed regarding language ideology, practice, and management. Firstly, Turkish maintenance is important, as beyond any concerns regarding the children’s futures or education, speaking the Turkish language means preserving their identities and values. Secondly, language practices vary according to the language preferences of family members, interlocutors, and the context of the conversation. Thirdly, parents have language management strategies for both Turkish and Dutch. Turkish management activities are mostly limited to the home environment while parents rely on sociolinguistic support for Dutch management. In addition, contrary to strong Turkish maintenance ideologies, not all of the families are explicitly involved in Turkish management. The major management strategy is the conscious use of Turkish until children’s school age. Still, the maintenance of Turkish among third-generation children is reinforced by the factors contributing to language maintenance, such as easy access to Turkish media and spouses from Turkey, which are also highlighted in the literature regarding Turkish maintenance in the Netherlands (Backus 2013; Eversteijn 2011; Extra and Yagmur 2010).

FLP is not only about the free will of the family members, but the result of various pull and push factors. On the one hand, many families are in interaction with people and organisations from the same ethnic background, and they are expected to use Turkish there. On the other hand, there are the expectations of mainstream institutions. The integration ideology of these institutions and the
language preferences of immigrant parents at children’s schools in particular are always hot topics in the families. They are confused because the media, schools, welfare organisations, politics, and other institutions have contradictory ideas regarding integration and mother tongue use. That is why they generally hesitate to use their mother tongue freely outside the home context with the fear it opposes the societal ideology, which also creates a psychological pressure on minorities. Nakamura (2016) also found in her research with Thai mothers in Japan that mothers feel pressure to use Japanese in interaction with their children due to political, economic, and sociocultural factors. Still, in the current study, when parents observe that teachers at school value the use of Turkish as the home language, they feel more secure and they hold more positive beliefs regarding the language.

In addition, in this study, although the third-generation children easily understand and use Turkish, as also asserted by Eversteijn (2011), they tend to favour Dutch in their daily interactions as long as the interlocutor understands Dutch. Both linguistically and culturally, children get input about mainstream society as they reach school age, and this influence gets more powerful as children grow older. This effect on children may cause them to support the mainstream ideology as valid and necessary, and cause more distance to the home language.

In the current study, we worked with both first-generation and second-generation parents with different levels of education. Regardless of educational, generational, and gender differences, these parents have similar ideologies (regarding Turkish maintenance) and language practices (parents are more Turkish-oriented while children are shifting to Dutch); however, first-generation mothers with lower degrees of education put the most effort into Dutch language management activities. Mothers do their best to improve their children’s Dutch skills, which, in their view, will lead to greater success at school and better career prospects in the future. They constantly seek Dutch learning opportunities both inside and outside the home. They try to find the best Dutch television programmes, look for tutors to read in Dutch to their children, and learn more about how to support their children by asking teachers and relevant organisations.

Further, regardless of generation and educational differences, mothers were also more active than fathers in Turkish management activities. This was primarily apparent through their struggle to foster standard use of Turkish in their children. Many Turkish children have regional Turkish accents (Leseman 2000). In general, people tend to associate accents with foreignness (Eksner 2006) and with lower status social groups, and this may cause discrimination (Fuertes et al. 2012). As many Turkish people are constantly in touch with the Turkish community in the Netherlands in daily life, and in Turkey during holidays (Backus 2013), the mothers’ efforts for standard Turkish might be a result of an avoidance of stigmatisation among Turkish speakers.

In general, parents’ expectations of their children regarding their school life and future career prospects are important factors in shaping their FLP (Curdt-Christiansen 2009). In the immigration context, families value education and know that social mobility is only possible through education (Ogbu 1987). That is why third-generation children’s educational achievement is the main topic of conversation in every family, being a key factor in parental decisions. They have realistic expectations of living in mainstream society with respect to their children’s language competence (Moin, Schwartz, and Leikin 2013).

FLP of second-generation immigrant families is an under-researched topic. The novelty of this research is its elaboration of the understanding of the second generation by illustrating the differences between the first, second, and even third generations. Seemingly, the second generation builds the bridge for the third generation as they highly respect the Turkish language and customs, while also managing the expectations of mainstream society, thereby providing their children with better future prospects. However, studies of Turkish immigrant children in the Netherlands reveal that children who have language problems in Turkish also have problems in Dutch (Akoglu and Yagmur 2016; Leseman 2000; Verhoeven 1994). Parents in this study have positive feelings towards teachers who acknowledge Turkish, and the presence of minority families and language has an effect on the community (as in ‘Reversing Language Shift’ by Fishman 1991). This recognition strengthens the relationship between minority families and teachers. This example may inspire projects both in
the Netherlands and throughout Europe. Research to attain a deeper understanding of FLP of minorities, teachers’ experiences in bilingual classrooms (e.g. Palviainen and Mård-Miettinen 2015), recognition of immigrants’ home language and cultural difference for student assessment (Levin and Shohamy 2012) and projects for multilingual education, like Hélot and Young (2006) conducted in France, will increase linguistic and cultural awareness and mutual understanding for both minority communities and educational practitioners.
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