insan & toplum
the journal of humanity and society

Assessing the Link between Language and Identity: The Construction of Identities among Belgian-Turkish Migrants

Zeynep Yılmaz Hava

Abstract: Multiculturalism and multilingualism are inevitable consequences of international migration. Contact between different linguistic or ethnic groups causes the development of expressions specific to one's identity and for migrants it results in the construction of hybrid identities which are very complex to define and understand without knowing the conditions of their construction processes. This paper aims to contribute to the literature about the identity construction of migrants, to assess the link between language and identity in this process. In this regard, I have pursued a qualitative research focusing on the second-generation Turkish-speaking community in Belgium. As a result of the study, it is observed that the migrants' ideologies show traces of national discourses most of the time but their actual language performances and practices contradict these ideologies. The immigrants facing institutional or cultural racism in the host country create new multidimensional and transnational spheres in which they perform multiple identities through varying language usages. This research aims to provide a more comprehensive and deeper analysis regarding the link among language ideologies, linguistic differences and identity construction processes in the contemporary Europe, starting from the Belgian case by taking into account the linguistic aspect in a supra-national environment.

Keywords: Language ideology, multilingualism, Turkish immigrants, identity construction, integration policies, transnationalism, linguistic differentiation.

Öz: Çok-kültürlülük ve çok-dillilik, uluslararası göçün kaçınılmaz sonuçlarıdır. Farklı dilsel ya da etnik gruplar arasındaki etkileşim, kişinin kimliğine özgü ifadelerin gelişimine neden olur ve göçmenler için hibrid kimliklerin oluşumuyla sonuçlanır. Bu hibrid kimliklerin anlaşılması ve tanımlanması için öncelikle kimlik inşa süreçlerini ve koşullarını doğru anlamlandırmak gerekir. Günümüzün çok dilli ve çok kültürlü Avrupa'sında, dil ideolojilerinin farklı kültürleri ve dilleri meşrulaştırma biçimleri, ulusal kimliklerden Avrupa kimliklerine kadar farklı kimliklerin bulunduğu bir çevrede bulunan göçmenlerin kimlik inşa sürecinde büyük öneme sahip. Bu araştırma, göçmenlerin kimlik oluşumuyla ilgili literatüre katkıda bulunmayı ve kimlik inşası süreçlerinde dil ile kimlik arasındaki bağlantının analitik bir bakış açısıyla değerlendirilmesini amaçlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda, Avrupa Birliği'nin merkezinde yer alan Belçika, çok dilliliğin hem devlet düzeyinde hem de sosyo-kültürel düzeyde var olduğu bir örnek olarak karışımıza çıkmaktadır. Bu sebeble, söz konusu araştırma için Belçika'daki Türk göçmenler üzerine odaklanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda, dil, kimlik ve aidiyet hususunda göçmenlerin söylemleri ile dilsel pratikleri arasındaki çelişkili durumlar ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca, göçmenlerin alıcı ülkede maruz kaldığı kurumsal ve kültürel ayrımcılık, buradaki göçmenlerin farklı dilsel pratikler ile inşa ettikleri ulusötesi ve çok katmanlı yeni kimlik arayışlarına itmektedir. Bu araştırmada yer alan Belçika özelindeki analizlerden hareketle, çağdaş Avrupa'daki dil ideolojileri, entegrasyon/asimilasyon politikaları ile Belçikalı-Türk vatandaşların kimlik inşa süreçleri arasındaki bağlantı hakkında kapsamlı ve derin bir analiz sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dil ideolojisi, çok-dillilik, çok-kültürlülük, Belçikalı-Türk göçmenler, kimlik, entegrasyon/asimilasyon politikaları, ulusaşırılık.

I would like to present my heartfelt thanks to my professor Eva-Marie Dubuisson and the referees for their support and guidance.

PhD Candidate, Istanbul Medeniyet University. zeynepyilmaz@std.sehir.edu.tr

DOI:10.12658/M0225
The Journal of Humanity and Society, 8(1), 2018, 67-84.
insanvetoplum.org

Submission: 29.04.2017
Revision: 16.10.2017
Acceptance: 31.12.2017
Online Publication: 10.01.2018

Introduction

Karen Tracy defines identity "as stable features of persons that exist prior to any particular situation, and are dynamic and situated accomplishments, enacted through talk" (Tracy, 2002, p.17). Here, Tracy acknowledges to some extent that identity is dynamic and changing in different contexts; however, she categorizes gender, ethnicity, age, national and regional origins as master identities (2002, p.18). However, the postmodern or constructionist paradigms have shown that even these forms of identities, which have long been perceived as primordial, fixed and solid structures, are actually fragmented, constantly changing and constructed concepts. Foucault, one of the most prominent constructionist scholars with a discursive approach, states that "the 'subject' is produced within discourse" (Hall, 1997). Stuart Hall elaborates on Foucault's views about the unfixed nature of identity (the "self" and the "subject"), and states that even though people may seem to have different personal features such as ethnicity or gender these personal identities will not have any meaning outside of the discourses in which they are produced (Hall, 1997, pp. 55- 56). Since the socially constructed discourses governing our knowledge and perception of the "self" are in a constantly changing position, we can say that our self-perceptions and perceptions of other people in terms of categorizations such as ethnic, racial or gendered identities are also continuously (re) constructed through our everyday practices and interactions. Although these two understandings have differing essentialist or anti-essentialist approaches towards the nature of identity, their common ground is that they think there is a strong link between language and the identity construction process and that our identities are constructed through our everyday usages of language (together with some other factors) because similar to Tracy's understanding, the constructionist paradigm also suggests that our knowledge and meaning of the world around us are produced through language and we construct and make meaning of our identities via language (Hall, 1997).

Indicating that identity is fragmented, however, I do not mean to say that it is not coherent. The point here concerns the complex identity features which come together to form a self-representation and self-perception of either an individual or a group in changing contexts of interactions, rather than assuming each person or group has a never changing and one single identity (could be ethnic, religious, gendered, racial, linguistic etc.). Amin Maalouf, who has both French and Lebanese ties, also conceptualizes this point in very enlightening statements and says that "[i]dentiy can't be compartmentalised. You can't divide it up into halves or thirds or any other separate segments. I haven't got several identities: I've got just one,

made up of many components combined together in a mixture that is unique to every individual" (Maalouf, 2000, p. 3).

The issues of multiculturalism and multilingualism which are the inevitable consequences of international migration in Europe have more significance at this point because international migrants in Europe find themselves in host countries which are founded upon national ideologies and they face an environment where they are expected -and most of the time forced by the host countries- to choose and express only one national identity by leaving their national, ethnic and religious allegiances behind. However, such ideology and assimilation or integration policies related to this aim did not produce the expected consequences for many migrants (Castles & Miller, 1998). As a result, migrants coming from various linguistic or ethnic groups have constructed and continue to construct new multiple identities in a multilingual and multinational environment, and these new identities have too complex natures to define and understand without knowing the conditions of their construction processes.

For many years, a common and one united national and ethnic identity has been regarded as the main building block for socially cohesive societies in Europe, creating "imagined communities" (Anderson, 1991) which define themselves as "culturally distinctive from members of other groups with whom they have a minimum of regular interaction" (Eriksen, 2010). Monolingualism and monoculturalism have been the principles of these newly formed European nation states and multilingualism together with multiculturalism have been regarded as horrible threats to these nation states since they challenge the political legitimacy and sovereignty of these states. Only speaking the official language of a nation has become the symbol of good citizenship and multilingualism has been identified with being disloyal to one's nation (Gal, 2007, p. 149). In the following years, the discourse of multiculturalism was promoted by these European states so as to make the foreign migrants "integrate" into society and language has been one of the most actively and excessively used tools of various integration policies, but the idea of "melting pot" resulted in malfunctioning integration policies in major receiving countries. For example, the remarks of the German Chancellor Angela Merkel confessed to this by saying: "And of course, the approach [to build] a multicultural [society] and to live side-by-side and to enjoy each other… has failed, utterly failed" (BBC, 2013). These remarks have reinforced the nationalist discourse in Germany, by reinforcing the status of the migrants as racialized "foreigners" who needed to integrate more.

Although respect for diversities seems to be essential in European states' national discourses, we can still talk about an imposing structure of integration pol-

icies in many EU countries. Looking at the various integration policies in many of these countries, particularly the language ideologies and policies in Belgium for the purposes of this paper, it is possible to assert that what is meant by "integration" is in fact a euphemism and a mask for national assimilation (Balibar, 2001). Amin Maalouf mentions in his book *On Identity* that an individual's identity is basically constructed and foregrounded based upon the "other" or the threat of an "enemy". Balibar's conceptualization of nation states can be seen as an extension of this perspective to a broader group identity. According to Balibar's approach, European nation states legitimize the existence of their national sovereignty over their citizens by means of creating imaginary threats of other through immigrants and they stigmatize the immigrants, keeping them as foreigners or aliens different from the ones who are accepted as natural citizens. This stigmatization then gives birth to "institutional racism" together with repressive and humiliating methods of governance as tools for maintaining the sovereignty of the state (Balibar, 2001). In the case of Belgian-Turkish migrants, such an institutional racism is also supported by the social and "cultural racism" exercised by the local people (Balibar & Wallerstein, 1991). When migrants face such kinds of racialized practices in their host countries and when they are not content with these countries' national policies, they are directed towards creating new identity spheres for themselves in which they can maintain the multiplicity of their ethnicities and languages without having to sacrifice some parts of their identities (Balibar, 2001).

With regard to the language policies and language ideologies, national discourses in Belgium prescribe and produce written or unwritten rules and norms that direct the second-generation migrants to choose one language, one identity or one culture, as is mentioned above, even though Belgium is a multicultural federal state because each federal region most of the time acts as if they are separate nation states on their own. So, the ones who promote homogenization of the nation and culture contradict those who support multiculturalism and multilingualism most of the time. What is more important here is that this situation also leads to confusion among many migrants while constructing their self-perceptions and group identities because of the deep-down belief that they really have to be part of one nation, one language and one identity since this has been promoted as the normal and "natural human condition" (Gal, 2007). As a result of these conditions and some other socio-economic or political dynamics, the second-generation Belgian-Turkish migrants are left in a state of in-betweenness trying to comply with the top-down identity categorizations. Accordingly, they find solution in producing their own ethno-linguistic identities and *ethnoscape*s (Appadurai, 2007, p. 51) in which they preserve the multiple aspects of their identities as Belgian-Turkish

migrants, having diverse social, economic, political, religious or cultural ties maintained in a transnational or cross-borders sphere and they perform their multiple identities in varying contexts through language. The language they use is also multiple and crosses the borders of linguistic boundaries because they use Turkish and Flemish or Turkish and French in a mixed manner and the language they use change in different situational settings where they choose their language based on the identities they perform. In this way, they create various interrelated or non-related spheres in which they challenge the essentialist and seemingly homogenous boundaries by means of their multiple allegiances and language usages, creating flowing spheres of identities and "complex transnational imaginary landscapes" (Appadurai, 2007, p. 49).

The studies carried out so far regarding language and identity in Europe mostly deal with the issue either from a socio-linguistic (e.g., Edwards, 2009; Gubbins & Holt, 2002) or socio-political perspective (e.g., Heller, 2003; Kraus, 2008). There are also studies that start from a linguistic perspective but analyze the link between language and identity from an interdisciplinary approach, taking into account anthropology, education, sociology, political science, literary and cultural studies (e.g., Joseph, 2004; Heller, 2011). As for the studies focusing particularly on Belgium, there are also studies which mainly adopt a socio-linguistic approach to the issue (e.g., Swing, 1973; Auer, 2013; Edwards & Shearn, 1987). The results of these studies and alike are important in terms of revealing different ways of understanding how linguistic practices/ideologies and identity construction processes are embedded in each other in a continuous interaction with the social, political, or economic contexts in which they are exercised. On the other hand, we see numerous studies on Turkish international migration in Europe with a special focus on the immigrants' multiculturalism or transnationalism experiences (e.g., Pitkänen, Içduygu & Sert, 2012; Robins & Aksoy, 2015; Modood, Triandafyllidou & Zapata-Barrero, 2006). However, the literature that focuses on the language and identity link, taking into account the multicultural and transnational migration contexts from a linguistic anthropological perspective, is lacking in the existing literature. This study hopes to provide an interdisciplinary contribution to the field with a deeper understanding of the identity construction phenomenon for migrants that takes into account the linguistic aspects in a supra-national environment.

The link among language ideologies, linguistic practices, and self-formation is both very strong and intertwined. The main objective of this study is to analyze how the second-generation Belgian-Turkish migrants circumstantially construct and reproduce their multiple personal or group identities through language, and

how the institutional or cultural racisms they face both in Belgium and in Turkey shape these identity construction processes. In this paper, I also elaborate on the migrants' own language ideologies and attitudes so as to be able to analyze their identity construction processes. As a result of these analyses, it is observed that the second-generation Belgian-Turkish migrants' ideologies show traces of national discourses most of the time but their actual language performances and practices contradict these ideologies. While linguistic competence in Turkish is not the first and foremost yardstick for determining their sense of belonging into Turkish culture, linguistic competence in Flemish or French is perceived as the symbol of integration and sense of belonging to the Belgian society. It is also observed that even though Belgium is already a country that nurtures multilingualism and multiculturalism, the language ideologies and real life practices of the federal regions are maintained through nationalist discourses and this situation decreases the credibility of integration policies in Belgium and does not prevent the discriminatory practices against immigrants -who are seen as foreigners. Hence, the immigrants facing institutional or cultural racism create new multidimensional and transnational spheres in which they perform their multiple identities through varying language usages and in accordance with the context of their interactions.

Methodology and Data

Belgium constitutes a favorable site for a field study in terms of seeing the complex network of relationship between language and identity since it is a federal state in which there are different linguistic communities including the large population of Turkish speaking community. The first labor migration wave from Turkey to Belgium took place in 1964 (The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey, 2013) and the current estimated population of Belgian-Turks was around 200.000 in 2007 (Kaya & Kentel, 2007, p. 25). The immigration flow has been continuing since then and Turkish-origin migrants live in various regions of Belgium, creating different bilingual or multilingual communities.

While doing this research, I carried out interviews with second-generation Turkish-speaking community members in Belgium in August 2012. Turkish-speaking community in Belgium encompasses both Turkish and Kurdish people by definition, yet this data does not include any Kurdish people because I tried to obtain data from the regions where Turkish-speaking community is densely populated via snowballing and most of the population in the regions that I visited were Turkish, so the study includes Turkish-origin communities in terms of ethnicity.

The data in this research has been elicited through deep interviews which lasted approximately 45 minutes or one hour each in Turkish. The interviews were conducted after taking the verbal consent of the participants. The recordings are completely anonymous and they will only be used for academic purpose.

The interview questions basically cover the interviewees' background information, education and migration history, language attitudes, language practices, reflections on the concepts of identity, culture, nationhood and the sense of belonging, and their future plans.

In addition to these interviews I have also used participant observation method so as to be able to have a better understanding of the participants' language attitudes, language ideologies, their self-perceptions and interactional practices. This paper is presenting a qualitative analysis of the data obtained throughout this research period. The basic tool of analysis is the Foucauldian theory of discourse and his methodology of discursive analysis, which claims that "the subject is produced within discourse" and one must uncover the seeming unity of subject in order to reveal the discursive mechanisms which lead to the formation of self. In other words, one has "to break them [existing unities] up and then to see whether they can be legitimately reformed; or whether other groupings should be made; to replace them in a more general space which, while dissipating their apparent familiarity, makes it possible to construct a theory of them." (Foucault, 1972, pp. 29-30). While uncovering the seemingly unified identities, the context that produces the discursive mechanisms should be taken into consideration as well. Hence, the discursive methodology applied in this research also benefits from the analysis of Fairclough, focusing on the "relational nature" of discourse and "how discourse is shaped by relations of power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and belief, neither of which is normally apparent to discourse participants" (Fairclough, 1992, pp. 12).

The data used in this research was collected from Anvers, Brussels, Charleroi, Mons, Fontain L'eveque, Gent, Liège, Limburg, Beringen, and Verviers in Belgium. As a result of the federal system in Belgium, the Turkish-speaking communities differ from each other in Brussels, Flanders and Wallonia regions in terms of the languages they speak, so I have tried to reach people from diverse regions. There are 93 deep interviews in total; 20 from Brussels, 34 from Flanders and 39 from Wallonia. The data does not include people from the German-speaking region because the number of Turkish-speaking people was low there. The regions and the interviewees were chosen considering the effective use of time, logistic means, the

consent of the participants and I used the snowballing method because this made it is easier to reach the interviewees and take their consent.

The interviewees consist of 60 women and 33 men. The unequal distribution between men and women is due to snowballing, yet this unequal distribution does not have any negative effect on the results of the research since the interview questions were not gender specific, except for the questions about military service. Also, the interviewees' ages range changes from 18 to 35, but the majority of the participants' ages change between 20 and 28.

As regards the definition of second-generation immigrants, it should be noted that it is not so easy to make sharp distinctions between the second and the third generation. Hence, instead of limiting the interviewees with a fixed definition of generation, I have defined second-generation immigrants in a relatively flexible way and interviewed people who were either born in Belgium or came to Belgium before the age of 7 and then were raised there. The occupations of the participants varied from university students, high school graduates and working people to housewives. Despite having different backgrounds and occupations, all of the participants completed the compulsory education in Belgium, i.e. they graduated from high school. Their educational background is important in order to find out the language of their education and its effect on their identity construction.

Before discussing the results of the interviews, another crucial point needs to be made regarding the communities in this research. It needs to be underlined that one of the biggest mistakes at this point would be to make clear-cut distinctions among the multiple group identities of these migrants and to assume that migrant groups as well as other "indigenous" groups in the host country are internally homogenous and unified groups (Wolf, 1982, p. 6). While talking about the second-generation Turkish-Belgian migrants here, it should not be understood that the interviewees in this research constitutes a homogenous migrant group. There are a great many divergent groups among the interviewees with different ethnic, religious, cultural or linguistic etc. backgrounds and they also have competing discourses which may lead to internal conflicts. Thus, the observations and claims presented in this paper have been conceptualized by keeping this fact in mind. The intention of this paper is not to categorize or to reach generalizing conclusions about the second-generation Belgian-Turkish population in Belgium; the intention is to analyze the interviews with a critical approach and to try to conceptualize the data in these interviews so as to have a broader and deeper insight into the complex relationship among concepts such as language, identity, ethnicity, nation, culture etc.

Language Practices in Belgium

It would be useful to give a basic overview of the main language practices in Belgium before elaborating on these practices from the perspectives of Belgian-Turkish immigrants.

There are three official languages in Belgium: French, Flemish, and German. The two main linguistic communities are Flemish-speaking community in Flanders and French-speaking community in Wallonia. Brussels is the capital region where both Flemish and French are official but the majority speak French. Turkish-speaking migrant communities in Flanders, Wallonia and Brussels are exposed to different languages and policies. These differences can be observed in the education system and in public services. For example, in Brussels, children learn both Flemish and French. However, it has been observed in this research that the number of people in Flanders who could speak French to a certain degree was higher than the number of people in Wallonia who could speak Flemish. This shows us that the language education in Belgium does not lead to the construction of bilingual communities in every region (in terms of Flemish and French).

For the Turkish-speaking community, bilingualism emerges between Flemish/French and Turkish. The Turkish-speaking community members learn Flemish or French at school, whereas they learn Turkish primarily from their families, and then from their friends or in their social environment. Some of them take Turkish culture lessons including Turkish education at summer schools most of which are provided by the T.R Directorate of Religious Affairs. Some of them take one- or two-hour classes of Turkish at primary school but this is a very rare practice. Apart from the official languages and Turkish, English is also among the languages many children learn at school.

Findings and Discussion

I present below a discussion on the link between language and identity for the Turkish-Belgian immigrants based upon my findings derived from the discourse analysis of my interviews and my observations from the field. This part is mainly divided into three sections: the language ideologies of Turkish-Belgian immigrants in relation to nationalist monolingual discourses; the ways of performing multiple identities in changing interactions and contexts; and the creation of transnational imaginary landscapes as a result of racialized practices and the feeling of in-betweenness.

Language Ideologies

Language ideology is defined by Silverstein as a "set of belief about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use" (as cited in Clyne, Hanks & Hofbauer, 1979, p. 193). In the introduction section, it is stated that we make meaning of the world around us through language. In accordance with this fact, we also adopt some ideologies or "sets of belief" about the world we perceive –including the language we use– and in this regard, language comes forward both as the subject and as the object of our knowledge. When one rethinks about these intricate relationships among language, ideologies and self-perceptions, it can be seen that what seems as purely linguistic choices can in fact be regarded as the embodiments of one's ideologies and perceptions. One of the most apparent examples of these language ideologies might be observed in monolingualism and language standardization attitudes of people in relation to the nationalist discourses.

In the case of Belgian-Turkish immigrants, language ideologies and attitudes of the immigrants have been analyzed from this perspective and it has been observed that immigrants' ideologies show traces of national discourses most of the time but their actual language performances and practices contradict these ideologies.

The majority of the participants in this research are bilingual, speaking either Turkish-Flemish or Turkish-French. However, it is viewed that a great majority of the interviewees mention Turkish as their native language in the first place, even though they acknowledge that they are not "competent" enough. For instance, Ali (27-year-old university student in Gent) says explicitly "I know I can't speak Turkish as well as you do, but it's my mother tongue in the end. I wish I could speak Turkish as good as Flemish". Similarly, another university student from Liege this time (Merve, 18-year-old) says "My mother tongue is of course Turkish". There are some interviewees who acknowledge their bilingualism and gives either Turkish/Flemish or Turkish/French as answers in the first place, but the majority equals mother tongue to Turkish, although they acknowledge their mixed language use in the later phases of the interviews. This the single-language answering tendency reveals how the immigrants' language ideologies are affected by the national monolinguist discourses.

Speaking Turkish becomes the symbol of their Turkish identity and "Turkish culture". For example, the participants state that they would want their children to definitely learn Turkish so as to know about their culture and not to forget where they are coming from. Forgetting Turkish language or not speaking it well is considered an act of being unfaithful to their ancestors, their past and their homeland.

Since they are living in a country other than their homeland and they are usually exposed to assimilationist or discriminatory discourses, they feel that their Turkish identity is threatened, so they give much more importance to speaking Turkish and they are trying to be loyal to their native language and cultural heritage (Hornberger & Pütz, 2006). For example, the dialogue between me and Gözde[1] (a 22-year-old university student in Brussels) about her native language is as below:

> Z: What is your mother tongue Gözde?
>
> G: Turkish.
>
> Z: Well, which language do you use best in your opinion?
>
> G: My French is better of course. I mean my Turkish is not that bad but for example I can't read any books in Turkish, do you know that? I find it very hard to understand. […]
>
> Z: Then, how do you define mother tongue? Is it the language you learn from your parents? I mean, according to what is your mother tongue Turkish?
>
> G: My mother tongue is Turkish because I am Turkish. Ok, we live here in Belgium right now; we are the citizens of this country but our roots are Turkish. And Turkish is the language of our ancestors and grandparents. If we forget our past, we would be lost in here. But this doesn't mean that we will only speak Turkish and not speak the language of this country. I am also strongly opposed to this. If you live in this country, then you have to speak its language but without forgetting your own culture of course.

In this dialogue which has recurred in my interviews many times, Gözde emphasizes that Turkish is the language of her ancestors and it symbolizes the shared heritage of Turkish identity. Although she is not very good at Turkish, she accepts Turkish as her mother tongue. At this point, it is seen that her perception of Turkish as a mother tongue relates to some ethnic and cultural ties rather than to her linguistic competency level. She supports learning and speaking Turkish as a way of resisting the threat of being assimilated and constructs her identity as both Turkish and Belgian.

Another important aspect of language ideologies concerns linguistic competence and standardization. According to the majority of the participants, there is a denial of linguistic competence in Turkish by Turkish-speaking community most of the time. Here, we can observe an example of one of the conflicting aspects of their language ideologies and identity construction processes. As it is also seen in the dialogue above, the majorities of the Belgian-Turkish immigrants in this research

1 The names have been given randomly. All translations from Turkish to English are made by the author. Turkish versions of the quotations are given in footnotes.

give priority to Turkish and embrace it as their mother tongue without feeling the need to assess their linguistic competence in the first place. Then, this is justified in their discourses of being loyal to their native land, preserving their identity in Belgium, not being assimilated but being integrated to the society protecting their multiple identities and transnational allegiances. On the other hand, these same interviewees later on assert that linguistic competence in Turkish is measured by their vocabulary knowledge and "standard" use of Turkish, when they comment on the questions about their criteria in defining "good" Turkish/Flemish/French.

More importantly, their attitudes towards linguistic competence in either French or Turkish show a different pattern than those towards Turkish. While linguistic competence in Turkish is not the first and foremost yardstick for determining their sense of belonging into Turkish culture, linguistic competence in Flemish or French is perceived as the symbol of integration and sense of belonging to the Belgian society. For instance, when we ask about what it takes to be a part of Turkish culture, Esra (28-year-old, university graduate from Verviers) says:

> You have to embrace the Turkish values. I mean, Turks are very hospitable for example. They care about family very much. You have to preserve your religion as well, be a good Muslim. This is both necessary for not forgetting your own culture and also not representing a bad image for Muslims and Turks here. And you shouldn't forget Turkish of course.

On the other hand, when asked about what it takes to be a part of Belgian culture, the criteria which she utters in the first place is linguistic competence:

> You have to speak French very good. That's for sure. Unless you speak the language you can never prove yourself here and you will always stay a stranger. But if you know French, then people here no longer sees you as an immigrant. I am a citizen of this country just like they are.

The reasons of second-generation immigrants explaining the need for learning Turkish and that for learning Flemish or French differ from each other. Learning Turkish symbolizes the link with their ancestors, culture and Turkey, whereas learning Flemish or French is considered necessary for integration and progress in Belgium. Thus, it is observed that the personal and group identities of second-generation Belgian-Turks are constructed in two ways. On one hand, they construct a Turkish identity based upon their cultural, ethnic, and religious heritages and perform this identity through the Turkish language. On the other hand, they construct a Belgian identity based upon their citizenship rights, their social, political or multicultural environment and the integration policies in Belgium and they perform this identity either through Flemish or through French. Nevertheless, while

this dichotomy is useful in analyzing the ongoing identity-works for Belgian-Turks, it should always be kept in mind that these identity performances intertwine in everyday practices and in daily usages of language.

When it comes to the ideologies about standardization, the effect of monolingualism and nationalist discourses becomes more apparent. Standardization of languages is one of the basic tools used in nation-creating processes. Nation states create a single national language and fix it later on, prescribing lots of norms and rules about it, just as one can see in the institutions such as Académie française or Turkish Language Institution (TDK). In this trend, one 'correct' way of language use is imposed on people; hierarchies among different dialects are reinforced and multilingualism is denigrated (Anderson, 1991, pp. 44-45). One can also see the resulting effects of these standardization policies in the language ideologies of Belgian-Turks but once more there are different ideologies regarding Turkish and Flemish/ French.

Standardization of language is favored by many of the participants with regard to Turkish, Flemish or French. On one hand, the dialects and accents of these languages are seen as normal indices of where people are from. However, different accents of Turkish or French are tolerated but not regarded as the "correct" way of speaking. The "correct" way of speaking is associated with the standardized Turkish prevalent in Turkey (known as İstanbul Türkçesi). The following quote from one of the interviews with a 20-year-old social service worker (Ayşe) can exemplify this situation:

> I am happy that my foreign language is French. I think French is so polite. Flemish sounds rude to me. French in France is more elegant, proper and formal. Beautiful French is the French spoken in France I think. I can't find someone who speaks beautiful Turkish among Turks living here. They come here from various villages in Turkey. Since they don't get a good education here, the language eventually becomes degenerated. My father would say 'don't disrupt the standard accent of Turkish'. I strongly agree with him. [...] Meaning standard Turkish, beautiful Turkish... I mean for example just like the way you speak right now, like the language spoken in major cities such as Istanbul or Ankara.

In addition to the ideologies regarding the ways of speaking a language, it is seen in this quote that the language ideologies of people readily lead to ideologies of stereotyping. This situation can be explained by means of the iconization process, which can be defined as one of the language ideology processes put forward by Susan Gal and Judith Irvine (2000, p. 37) This process can simply be defined as attributing a personal identity to the speaker looking at his/her speech acts as mistaking indices for icons.

In this research, it has been reaffirmed that almost all participants in the interviews have stereotypical images about Flemish, French or Turkish people shaped by their language ideologies about the Flemish, French or Turkish languages. For example, interviewees who think the Flemish language is rude, cold and unsentimental also think that Flemish people are cold. Also, all of the interviewees think that Turkish is a 'beautiful" language. It is richer in vocabulary and meaning, more sentimental than Flemish or French and accordingly, Turkish people are considered to be warm-blooded, more intimate, more emotional etc. just like we can see in the remarks of Ahmet (a 28-year-old chemist from Gent):

> I think Flemish is a very rude and cold language. You already see Flemish people are usually like that. Always distant, cold and over disciplined of course… I mean you can't be too intimate with a Flemish the minute you want. But look at Turks! Turkish people are very intimate and tolerant. That's why I like speaking Turkish and hanging out with Turks very much. And also I think Turkish is definitely a very sentimental language. Love or anger, there are so many words to describe all kinds of feeling. This is not the case for Flemish. It's not flexible.

As it is clearly seen in this quote, Ahmet establishes direct correlations between the personal characteristics of Belgian or Turkish people and their language, labeling Flemish people as cold, strict and rude; whereas Turkish people are labeled as tolerant and sincere.

Situational dimension of the construction of identities and domain specific usage of languages

In the beginning of the paper, it has been mentioned that the second-generation Belgian-Turks perform their multiple identities in a changing pattern in various contexts and interactions. Although it should be emphasized that one needs to avoid trying to explain the identity-work of the migrants in binary oppositions, it should also be asserted that there is a frequently observed public- private dichotomy in terms of the language use of immigrants in Belgium. This public- private dichotomy provides us with more insightful conceptualizations when it is analyzed from the perspective of language ideologies and linguistic differentiation processes (Gal, 2005, p. 25). As a result of the language policy in Belgium which prescribes Flemish or French as two official languages and languages of education, the immigrants and their children are educated in these languages, and they learn Turkish in their family or in their social environment. So, Flemish or French becomes the language of public sphere which includes spheres such as school, work, law, social services etc., and Turkish becomes the language of private sphere which includes their family, their friends etc.

If we look at this distinction in terms of the two other linguistic differentiation processes proposed by Gal and Irvine (2007, p. 38; 2005, p. 25), which are fractal recursivity and erasure we can claim that this public- private distinction becomes a tool of reinforcing national and monolingual ideologies by means of creating recurring oppositions between public and private spheres and ignoring what is excluded from public sphere.

In the case of second-generation Belgian-Turks, this recursivity is made between Turkish and Flemish/French and it makes the immigrants live in fragmented linguistic and social spheres, leading them to varying performances of identities in accordance with the changing and flowing spheres and through their language practices they transform and reproduce these spheres. An example of this public- private dichotomy in terms of language practices experienced by second-generation immigrants and how it affects the ways of thinking of these immigrants can be seen below in the remarks of Mehmet (a 24-year-old university student in Leuven):

> I mean it is too hard to make a distinction… But for example I think in Flemish when I'm at school because I was educated in either Flemish or French. I always feel the need to speak Flemish when we talk about things related to school, municipality and other official matters. But when I'm with my parents or with my friends, we generally speak in Turkish. Of course there are some shifts sometimes. So, I think my emotional language is Turkish but the language of my logic is Flemish.

As can be seen in this quote, such a public- private distinction is not only constitutive in terms of political practices but it also shapes the linguistic and social identity formation of the immigrants. As a result of living in these flowing and fragmented spheres, their interactions and language ideologies as well as their identities are socially constructed and reproduced.

Sense of belonging, in-betweenness and exclusion leading to the creation of new multidimensional spheres

The sense of belonging to a culture or a community is as important as the construction of a coherent identity for immigrants. Many of the participants mention that they go through an identity crisis when they are young, especially during adolescence, because of the dominant belief that they have to belong to one single nationality, culture or a community and they do not know where they belong. Most of them state that when they reach adulthood, they solve this crisis and accept that they have multiple identities performed in a multilingual and multicultural environment. For example, Murat (27-year-old graduate student from Brussels) says:

> It was very hard for me to sort out to where I belong at first. It's hard when you're young… But now I feel and accept that I belong to both countries and both cultures. I am Turkish and Belgian at the same time and the same degree. I am also a European citizen at the same time. It's a mix like this…

However, social exclusion and discrimination continues to exist for many immigrants. All participants in this research share the feeling of in-betweenness and they feel they are "foreigners" both in Belgium and in Turkey. This situation is also reflected in their language ideologies and practices because they mostly state they are not fully "competent" both in Turkish and Flemish/French.

Regarding the issue of integration into society, while some of the interviewees argue that immigrants' faults are ignored in this process, many others argue that it will never be possible for the Turkish-speaking community to be completely accepted by the Flemish or French community unless they are assimilated. This portrait supports the views of Balibar (2001, p. 37) affirming that although integration policies in the EU and Belgium are mentioned very often, most of the real-life practices and policies (including language practices) put the immigrants in a stigmatized position where they are exposed to institutional and cultural racism.

Conclusion

In this paper, I try to show that identities which seem unified and primordial are in fact fragmented and socially constructed concepts. An individual's identity is constituted by various allegiances such as ethnic, national, religious, gendered etc. which form unique identities for each individual, and language is at the very center of the construction processes of these unique identities. Identities are not only expressed via language but are also performed through language; however, these construction processes and the complex relationship between language and identity are not easy to understand without deep and critical analyses.

For such critical evaluation, I conduct analyses about the second-generation Belgian-Turkish immigrants, trying to assess the strong relationship between language and identity in the international labor migration context in Belgium. I elaborate on the language ideologies of these immigrants and try to understand their language ideologies in relation to nationalist discourses which promote monolingualism and monoculturalism in contrary to the actual linguistic and cultural practices of international migrants in Belgium. Here, it is observed that even though Belgium is already a country that nurtures multilingualism and multiculturalism, the language ideologies and real life practices of the federal regions are maintained

through nationalist discourses and this situation decreases the credibility of integration policies in Belgium and does not prevent the discriminatory practices against immigrants -who are seen as foreigners. As a result, the immigrants hover between resisting a top-down labeling via transcending the national boundaries and essentialist categorizations, and trying to resolve the identity conflicts they face via defining themselves and their allegiances through these very categories. Hence, the immigrants facing institutional or cultural racism create new multidimensional and transnational spheres in which they perform their multiple identities through varying language usages and in accordance with the context of their interactions.

While analyzing the interviews in terms of language ideologies, I relate the language ideologies of the second-generation Belgian-Turkish migrants to broader nationalist ideologies particularly through language standardization, stereotypes and domain specific use of language. Furthermore, I highlight the contradictions between their actual linguistic practices and their language ideologies. Following these analyses, I look at the situation of the second-generation Belgian-Turkish immigrants with regard to their need for the sense of belonging, the exclusionary and discriminatory practices which lead them to feel in-between and the resulting creations of new multidimensional spheres that challenge the boundaries of nationalism, monolingualism and monoculturalism.

The link between language and identity could be further developed with larger sample cases or comparative studies from other countries or other migrant groups in the same country. It is also possible to widen the scope of this study by benefitting from socio-linguistic, psychological, or socio-economic analyses as well. Considering the lack of linguistic anthropological studies in migration contexts, I believe this study provides a contribution to the literature on international migration, multiculturalism/transnationalism discussions, and the studies about Turkish migration to Europe from a different perspective, by focusing on a less emphasized and often-ignored linguistic aspect of transnational or multicultural identities in Europe.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso Press.

Appadurai, A. (2007). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In J. X. Inda and R. Rosaldo (Eds.), *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader* (pp. 47-65). Massachusetts: Black Well Publishers.

Auer, P. (Ed.). (2013). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge.

Balibar, E., & Wallerstein, I. (1991). Is There a 'Neo-Racism'? In Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (Eds.) *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, (C. Turner, Trans.), (pp. 17–28). London: Verso.

Balibar, E. (2001). Droit de cite or Apartheid? In *We, the people of Europe?* (pp. 31-50). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

BBC. (2013, March 1). Merkel says German multicultural society has failed [News article]. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-11559451

Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (1998). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. 2nd edition. London: Macmillan Press.

Clyne, R., Hanks, W., Hofbauer, C. (Eds.). (1979). *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193- 247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Edwards, J., & Shearn, C. (1987). Language and identity in Belgium: Perceptions of French and Flemish students. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *10*(2), 135-148.

Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and identity: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Eriksen, T. H. (2010). *Ethnicity and nationalism: Anthropological perspectives*. 3rd edition (pp. 117-146). New York: Pluto Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The arhceology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith). New York: Pantheon Books.

Gubbins, P., & Holt, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Beyond boundaries: Language and identity in contemporary Europe* (Vol. 122). Multilingual matters.

Gal, S. (2005). Language ideologies compared: Metaphors of public/private. In *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *15* (1), 23–37. California: University of Califonia's Press.

Gal, S. (2007). Multilingualism. In C. Llamas & L. Mullany & P. Stockwell (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics* (pp. 35- 83). London and New York: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (pp. 13- 75). London: Sage Publications.

Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, *7*(4), 473-492.

Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to post-nationalism: A critical ethnography of language and identity*. Oxford University Press. Hornberger, N. H., & Pütz, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Language loyalty, language planning, and language revitalization: recent writings and reflections from Joshua A. Fishman*. The United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Joseph, J. (2004). *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. New York: Springer.

Kaya, A. & Kentel, F. (2007). *Belgian-Turks: A bridge or a breach between Turkey and the European Union?* Belgium: King Baudouin Foundation.

Kraus, P. A. (2008). *A union of diversity: language, identity and polity-building in Europe*. Cambridge University Press.

Maalouf, A. (2000). *On Identity* (B. Bray, Trans.). London: The Harvill Press.

Modood, T., Triandafyllidou, A., & Zapata-Barrero, R. (2006). *Multiculturalism, Muslims and citizenship: A European approach*. London and New York: Routledge. Pitkänen, P., Içduygu, & A., Sert, D. (2012). *Migration and transformation: Multi-level analysis of migrant transnationalism*. New York: Springer.

Robins, K., & Aksoy, A. (2015). *Transnationalism, migration and the challenge to Europe: The enlargement of meaning*. London and New York: Routledge.

Swing, E. S. (1973). *Language and identity in Belgium*. Philadelphia: Convention of the National Council of Teachers of English.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey. (2013, April 20). *Turkish Citizens Living Abroad*. Retrieved from http://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-expatriate-turkish-citizens.en.mfa#

Tracy, K. (2002). *Everyday talk*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Wolf, E. (1982). *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.