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INTRODUCTION

Seen as 'the best assimilated migrants', the Dutch were popular migrants in the fifties, when migration from the Netherlands to Australia reached its peak, but by 1984 they had slipped to 6th place in popularity, according to a mid-year opinion poll. Nowadays they form what is very much a greying group, since hardly any new Dutch migrants are settling in Australia. The figures in chapter 4 Table 1, show that in the ten years between 1975 and 1985 only 10,956 Dutch settlers arrived in Australia, and that in the same period 3,112 Dutch settlers left. While the Dutch formed the fourth largest group of non-English speakers in 1983, it may not be long before they cease to get separate mention as an ethnic group. It is thus important to look at Dutch speech in Australia now, while sufficient first generation Dutch speakers remain, especially since hardly any of their children have learned to speak Dutch.

One of the reasons I decided to look at language maintenance among the Dutch in Australia was that over the years people have so often said to me: 'you Dutch fit in so well, you do assimilate so well here in Australia...'. Usually they meant this as a compliment, but for some obscure reason I found it often difficult to accept it as such. It seemed to me to almost imply that Dutch people on the whole were prepared to forget their native language and culture in order to
assume another language and culture. Statements such as 'the Dutch assimilate so well', 'the Dutch are our invisible migrants' and 'the Dutch are the most monolingual migrants' are often heard. But are such generalisations correct? Do such statements apply to all Dutch migrants, regardless, for example, how long they have been away from the Netherlands, or their educational background, the country of birth of their spouse and many other factors? Questions such as: 'Why do Dutch migrants so rarely speak Dutch with each other and why do they not worry about the fact that their children do not speak Dutch?' formed the basis for my second reason for this research. In trying to find out more about Dutch speech behaviour it was important to look for effects of assimilation or integration and to discover which extralinguistic factors, if any, could be linked with this apparently typically Dutch linguistic behaviour. To this purpose I have combined the results of a questionnaire with my observations of Dutch speech as spoken by first generation Dutch migrants in Canberra.
CHAPTER 1

THE QUESTION

Do Dutch people speak Dutch at all with other Dutch people in Australia, or is it true that they have integrated so well in this country that here, even among each other, they prefer to use English rather than their own language? In other words, how important as a cultural good is their language to them; do they teach it to their children; are they at all concerned about maintaining it, and, if so, about keeping it pure? Is ethnic group membership of any importance to the Dutch, and can it be that, contrary to common views, their language is one of the main criteria of this group membership? And if all the answers to these questions turn out to be negative, why would this be so, and why would the Dutch be different from many other ethnic groups in this respect? Moreover, if it is not their native language they pass on as a cultural good to the next generation, what other values do they pass on instead, for many second generation children from Dutch parentage do certainly harbour some feelings of 'Dutchness'. What are the core values for the Dutch? Previous research has shown that the Dutch do place less cultural value on their language (Clyne, 1977) than, for example, the Poles, for whom Polish is a core value (Johnston, 1976; Smolicz, 1979), and it even seems that for the Dutch the importance of their language is in this respect diminishing all the time.

The aim of this research was firstly, to try and find the answers to these questions. Firstly to show that this is a complex social issue which is
distorted by generalisations such as 'the Dutch are our invisible migrants' or 'the Dutch are the most monolingual migrants'. Secondly, it aims to describe Dutch speech as it is now spoken by the Dutch after many years of residence in Australia, often without any refreshing from recent returns to the home country. The focus of this research is totally on active language skills and not on passive skills.

Thus the aim is to find out to what extent Dutch has been maintained, how extensive the influence of English and the shift to English is, and the exact nature of this shift, for example with respect to borrowing, language switching, and transference phenomena. Transference takes place when an element is transferred from one language into another, whether this is a lexical item, the meaning of a word, a syntactic rule, intonation or stress, a phoneme or allophone, or a discourse marker. Because of the closeness of Dutch and English it was not always possible, in spoken language, to decide what belonged to which language.

Dutch-English bilinguals have a choice between four modes of speaking. These are:

i) Dutch, this would only be possible with Dutch monolinguals, but it rarely occurs

ii) English, with English monolinguals

iii) Dutch-English, where English forms the base or dominant language

iv) English-Dutch, where Dutch forms the base or dominant language.

This matter of choice is not so simple that one can say that Dutch, compared
with English, has low prestige and therefore it is undesirable to keep it up, or that the longer one lives in Australia the less one maintains one's language and the more proficient one becomes in English. For example, as will be shown below, there is considerable variation in attitudes and in actual language usage and speech types between those who arrived here in the fifties, the peak of Dutch migration to Australia, and those who arrived in the sixties. This difference in attitudes and language usage, moreover, does not necessarily correlate with length of residence in Australia.

In general the Dutch manage very well in English. Table 4.3 shows that on arrival in Australia 35% of the men knew English and 48% had at least some knowledge of the language, while 46% of the women knew English and 38% had some knowledge. This is very much in contrast, for example, with the Italians in North Queensland, of whom, on leaving Italy, 'very few spoke standard Italian ... and even fewer spoke the language of the country of immigration' (Bettoni, 1981:11). Unfortunately there has never been a census which has addressed this question of knowledge of English prior to arrival in Australia. It was therefore impossible to find out how much of the 'successful' assimilation of the Dutch, in comparison with other ethnic groups, should be attributed to prior knowledge of English.
CHAPTER 2

AN OVERVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 LANGUAGES IN CONTACT

Australia today is very much a multilingual society with many people speaking and or understanding more than one language. On the basis of census figures it is estimated that in 1981 Australia had 2,937,357 overseas-born residents and that of these 1,611,015 - children under the age of five are not included in this last figure - speak a language other than English. Languages are coming in contact with other languages all the time and more often than not these will influence each other. It is important for successful integration in the new country that immigrants are, or try to become as soon as possible after their arrival, proficient in the language of that country and develop a cultural awareness of that country. This means that they sooner or later will become bilingual, and once having the command of more than one language they will then have to choose which one to use in a particular speech situation. This choice is not only based on the individual speaker's language competence; extra-linguistic factors such as topic, setting, and interlocutor are also very important. As well as acquiring the second language, gaining knowledge of the new culture is necessary in order to be able to communicate with ease in the new language. Nearly all Dutch migrants in the Australian Capital Territory are
bilingual. For example only 0.7% of those 15 years and older speak no English at all at home, and it is possible that these people may speak English elsewhere. Of the remaining 99.3% some may speak only English at home, and it is important to establish to what extent they have maintained fluency in Dutch. Wherever the Dutch are involved in language contact there is nearly always bilingualism, more often than not this is followed by near complete language shift in the next generation with little language maintenance.

2.1.1 Bilingualism

Pioneering work on bilingualism was carried out by Weinreich (Languages in Contact: 1953) and Haugen (The Norwegian Language in America: 1953, and Bilingualism in the Americas: 1956). Their work has continued to have a major influence on the field, though many new concepts have been introduced. Both Weinreich and Haugen focussed on the individual bilingual speaker, with a structuralist approach to grammatical structure. A few concepts, such as the degree of knowledge needed of each of the languages involved and the manner in which the languages are used, are shared by the disciplines which now study bilingualism. Some definitions have centered on bilingualism in individual speakers, while others have focussed on bilingual speech communities. Fishman (1966) especially has centered his research on bilingualism in societal context, the sociology of language, language maintenance and speech communities.

The various disciplines have established their own parameters for investigating bilingualism. Psychology, for example, has centered on measuring speed and linguistic dominance, the distinction between competence and
performance issues, and evaluating personality characteristics of speakers based on speech samples, while linguistics has been more concerned with the structure of the languages involved, the effects of the interaction between the languages which have come into contact with each other, such as what is the effect of language X on language Y, and vice versa, as a result of group interaction. Both psychology and linguistics have been dominated in their research on bilingualism by the phenomena of language production and performance. Language oriented sociological research has used aggregate data sets, which usually include data based on the respondent's self-reported language proficiency, often collected through a census, which is then correlated with background variables, and it has stayed away from social interaction and actually observed measurable data. This is in spite of the fact that in other domains sociolinguistics has concentrated on the different functions of speech in verbal communication in various situations, recognising that the when, where and with whom dimensions are important factors of sociolinguistic behaviour.

Educational research has been concerned with the process of acquisition of a second language. Gardner and Lambert have shown how motivation to learn a second language may influence the achieved competence in that language by distinguishing between integrative and instrumental motivation. They pointed out that 'Subjects who learn a second language merely for utilitarian purposes, e.g. because it is necessary for their career, are said to have an instrumental motivation, while those who do so because they wish to learn more about another linguistic community and perhaps become a potential member of this group of speakers are said to have an integrative motivation' (1972:14). When treating integrative and instrumental motivation as the two extremes of a
continuum, it is important to be aware that the difference between the two is only clearly discernible at the poles. Unfortunately my data did not provide enough variation on this parameter to measure the validity of this distinction, since only 17% knew no English on arrival in Australia, and these all stated integrative and instrumental type reasons for their motivation. The group was too small to subdivide in, for example, social groups.

Immigrants who are set to integrate quickly in the host society, as for example is the case with Dutch immigrants, seem to achieve greater fluency in the second language, possibly due to strong integrative motivation. It therefore seems more realistic not to dichotomise these two components of motivation, but to adopt this concept of a continuum, with purely instrumental motivation at one end and integrative motivation at the other. I believe that the Dutch have a willingness to use English rather than Dutch for practical reasons, such as economic advantage (instrumental motivation), combined with the desire to find out more about the new society and to become a member of that society (integrative motivation). I do not think that motivation in this type of situation can be interpreted in an either/or sense.

Psycholinguistics has established distinctions between different types of bilinguals, such as compound and co-ordinate bilinguals. Compound bilinguals, who have usually learned both languages simultaneously and use both languages interchangeably, are assumed to store their languages in one single system, while co-ordinate bilinguals, who very often have learned their second language at a later stage in life and most likely not in a family setting, have two systems which can be thought of as existing side by side. The latter type of bilingualism is also called successive or achieved bilingualism. All the
informants in this study are co-ordinate bilinguals, because they had learned English, when they were already fluent in Dutch, in school or after arriving in Australia. There were no differences in fluency in Dutch now between these two types of co-ordinate bilinguals.

One important parameter which is shared by all disciplines studying bilingualism, as has been mentioned above, is that of the degree of knowledge of each of the two languages the bilingual has to have in order to be bilingual. Haugen qualified as bilingual 'anyone who has acquired any degree of accomplishment in two languages - a speaker of one language who is able to produce complete and meaningful utterances in the other language' (1953: 6). Weinreich is no more specific and regards as bilingual anybody who uses two languages alternately (1953: 1). Such definitions are far removed from and much more flexible than Bloomfields earlier notion that bilingualism is a native-like control of two languages (1933, 1979: 56). Clyne (1972: 5) has revised Haugen's definition as follows to incorporate the essential communication processes of encoding and decoding: 'A speaker who is able to generate grammatical utterances in two languages'. About the acquisition process he says that the languages should be acquired 'by natural experience rather than by school learning'. This is the definition I will use in this study.

In the present study all individuals are bilingual as defined by Clyne, albeit that they vary widely in competence, from almost native-like competence in both languages to a state of incomplete mastery of both languages, where complete competence in the native language has been lost and complete competence in the second language has not yet been achieved, a state close to what Skutnabb-Kangas describes as semilingualism (1975). Although in this
study the speakers certainly felt at ease, using their own speech variety when communicating their ideas, they definitely felt less so when trying to use only English or Dutch. They would use Dutch when talking about experiences in the Netherlands and change to English when talking about daily events, such as going to work. Code-switching took place in both directions, from Dutch to English, and from English to Dutch. The topic of conversation dictated the language used. There was no variation in other extra-linguistic factors such as interlocutor, location (usually the informant's home), and type of interaction. Every now and then the informants would realise why I was there and they would make an effort again to use Dutch only. There was no incidence of what Hockett (1958) calls semi-bilingualism in the present study. He sees a semi-bilingual as a person who is a productive monolingual with a passive knowledge of the second language (a receptive bilingual).

Some of the informants in this study have had little opportunity to keep up their native language and now use an almost 'bookish' and 'dated' form of Dutch (words and expressions they know through reading books, and ones used in the Netherlands at the time they had left for Australia), which sounded very stilted. This happened particularly when they changed back to Dutch after they realised how much they were using English. They also had some trouble writing and when writing a letter would first compose it mentally in English, then translate it into Dutch. Their active language skills had suffered more than their passive skills; they had no difficulties in understanding and reading Dutch. Both languages were used by most informants interchangeably in the interview situation and there were few who would make no use of either one of the two languages at all. Use of one language was prompted by a preference for
that language or because of a particular topic or situation rather than a lack of competence in the other.

2.1.2 Language Maintenance

As has been said above, all the informants in this study are bilingual, but vary greatly in their degree of knowledge, competence, and in attitudes to usage of the two languages. Many different speech varieties occur and the skills in performance and usage vary, ranging from a dominantly Dutch with some English to a primarily English speech behaviour with some usage of Dutch. Speakers may be rated according to their degree of bilingualism, according to degree of dominance of either of the languages, or their fluency and ability in both languages with respect to all areas of language behaviour.

2.1.2.1 Domain analysis

Particularly important in relation to the maintenance of a language by a speech community is extent to which immigrants continue to use the mother tongue and the domains (another extra-linguistic factor) in which this language is retained. The concept of 'domain' has been developed by Fishman (1964:38, 1965:73, 1971:587). It can be seen as an abstraction of everyday speech situations, pertinent to appropriate persons, places, topics, situations and times. The speaker makes this language choice based on the implicit rules of appropriate behaviour in this context, including the preceding communication. This choice will indicate the amount of language maintenance or language shift in each individual's speech variety. Examples of such domains are the family,
the church, peer groups, educational institutions, and the work environment. But even though each particular domain may have a preferred code, factors such as the interlocutor, the topic and situation can influence the actual code used within that domain. The domain where the native language is most likely to be used are the 'home' and 'with friends'. If in these two domains, where the use of the mother tongue is generally accepted and which form the bases of continuing bilingualism (Fishman 1965; Glazer 1966), the second language is regularly used, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the maintenance of the native language is very limited or virtually non-existent. Table 2.1 indicates that the likelihood of native language maintenance among the Dutch in Australia is small, with 54% of the men and 44% of the women speaking only English at home.

(Table 2.1 about here)

Comparing first generation Dutch speakers with speakers of the other four of the five main immigrant groups in Australia, it appears that the Dutch have less chance of passing on their language to the next generation than the other language groups, because most of them do speak English at home, closely followed by the Germans. In the ACT more immigrants speak English at home than in Australia overall, while more men than women speak only English at home, and this is the case for all five immigrant groups. Those migrants whose first language is Dutch, but who were born outside the Netherlands - mostly in Indonesia - speak more Dutch at home than those born in the Netherlands itself. This in contrast to the other four groups, as Table 2.2 shows, where people who are actually born in the country of their first language speak this language at
TABLE 2.1

Persons speaking only English at home and persons speaking another language (and no English at all) at home by country of birth by sex. (Persons 15 years and over in the ACT and Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>18735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>24468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>27382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
home to the same extent or more than those born elsewhere.

In the present study, 60% of the first generation respondents still used their native language in one or two domains, while for the second generation the proportion has already decreased to 12% (overall - first and second generation together - the native language usage figures were markedly higher for women than for men: 62% versus 40%).

2.1.2.2 Clearcut and ambivalent factors leading to language maintenance or to language shift

Kloss in his study of language maintenance among Germans in the United States made a distinction between factors which clearly help the maintenance of community languages ('clearcut factors') and factors which can work either way and which he calls 'ambivalent factors', that is they may support language maintenance or they may lead to language shift. Clyne (1979: 120-21, 1982:29-30) has adopted these factors, removing those which only apply to the United States, and adding 'clearcut and ambivalent factors' which he regarded as pertinent to Australia. Some of the adopted 'clearcut factors' mentioned by Clyne as possibly having an influence on the maintenance of a community language in Australia are: early point of immigration, 'Sprachinseln' (= linguistic enclaves), rurality, native language as a school subject, while status and usefulness of the ethnic language, and (visiting) grandparents are added 'clearcut factors'. Lack of 'status and usefulness' of Dutch in Australia has led
TABLE 2.2

Five main groups of non-English language users in Australia.
Country of birth by first language spoken at home and
English spoken at home.
(percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language first spoken</th>
<th>Country of birth</th>
<th>Speak first language at home</th>
<th>Speak English at home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian (440,776)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (227,167)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (165,663)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch (110,516)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish (86,016)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.2 continued

Symbol:
- indicates that figures add up to less than 3,000, and have not been published because they should be regarded as unreliable.

Source:
This table is based on data from the Language Survey conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in May, 1983. It covers persons aged 15 years and over.
many of my informants to shift to English, while the presence of grandparents promotes maintenance of Dutch. Adopted 'ambivalent factors' include the size of the immigrant group, the educational background of the migrant, linguistic and cultural similarity, while added 'ambivalent factors' include prior knowledge of the second language, and the number of children in the family.

If a speech community regards its language as a core value - and the importance of language as a core value is different for each group (Smolicz 1979:58-60) - and as an important cultural good, then language maintenance will generally be high. The Dutch, however, do not seem to regard their language as a core value. If the proportion of speakers of English in the home domain is an indicator of community language maintenance, then the Dutch do not do too well in comparison with the other large ethnic communities in Australia (see Tables 2.1 and 2.2 above).

Clyne (1977:7) and Harvey (1974:137-38) found that visits from grandparents, trips to the Netherlands, parental usage of Dutch language and taking Dutch as an HSC subject did contribute at least to the second generation's passive if not active knowledge of Dutch. But Dutch is no longer an HSC subject and in the ACT it is not taught at all in schools, nor at the university anymore. One course is still being offered at the Canberra College of Technical and Further Education (TAFE). Students enrolled in this course are mostly spouses of first or second generation Dutch immigrants, and people intending to spend some time in the Netherlands in the near future.

Another variable associated with language maintenance is 'being older'. As Clyne
has pointed out (1977;3), '...with ...... the younger generation growing up and moving out of the house, the pressure toward assimilation on the part of the parents has eased.' Five Dutch people who were interviewed during case studies of the ethnic aged conducted by the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs seemed to have a greater desire in old age to be with Dutch people and to speak Dutch than they had when younger. What was important again in their case were the reasons why, where and with whom the bilingual person wants to use a particular language. A choice which is made according to economic, social and psychological reasons, and also extra-linguistic reasons, with different weightings given at each stage in life.

Areas where the native language tended to be maintained were those which involve a lot of learning by repetition or considerable emotional investment (Rabel-Heyman, Clyne). In this study the latter, for example, was manifested in a deliberately maintained accent in the second language and in expressing anger, while the former might manifest itself in the usage of a particular language in activities such as praying, counting, thinking, or spelling. These are activities usually engaged in from early childhood and several involve rote learning until the activity becomes automatic, often without much verbalisation. For these activities the language in which they had been taught was often still used. Out of habit the native language may be preferred over the second language. When expressing anger the choice is more difficult. On the one hand one may have a larger vocabulary in the native language, while on the other hand using the second language may make the occasion seem less serious, especially when using religious or sexual language.
Rabel-Heyman (1977:185) found that people have 'emotional reactions to their two languages', and that most adult immigrants seem to possess 'pockets of resistance to complete linguistic acculturation'. Figure 2.1 shows the difference between men and women in their choice of language for various (speech) activities, at least to the extent they were able to report them, with overall more first generation men using English than the women. More women still counted in Dutch than in English, while equal numbers of women expressed anger in Dutch or in English. Many informants were not sure whether they used any language at all in their dreams.

(Figure 2.1 about here)

This supports the more widely held view that women generally maintain their native language at a slightly higher rate than men (Clyne, 1982: 42, 48, 55; Johnston, 1972: 62) although not all studies show this result (McAllister, 1986: 30).

2.1.3 Language Shift

When migrants do no longer use their native language to communicate with each other, but use instead the language of the host country in all speech domains, one can say that a complete language shift has taken place. Rarely does this shift occur within one generation. Various different patterns of language usage exist, with at one end of the continuum a first generation which has maintained its native language and has a knowledge of the language of the host society, while the second generation has already become fluent in this language,
FIGURE 2.1

Whether respondents pray, dream, think, count, spell and express anger in Dutch, English or in both languages. (Percentages for men and women separately)
and may still have some passive knowledge of the mother tongue. At the other end of the continuum is a first generation with little knowledge of the new language, a bilingual second generation, and a third generation resembling the second generation at the other end of the continuum in that English is its dominant language but is combined with a passive knowledge of the mother tongue. Of all migrant groups which have been investigated the Dutch achieve a complete language shift the fastest (Clyne 1977). This is possibly due to the great similarity between English and Dutch, but also to attitudinal factors, as I will show below in Chapter IV. The Dutch seem in general to exert little or no pressure on their children to speak Dutch, certainly less so than other migrant groups (Harvey, 1974: 141; Johnston, 1976: 179). The present study found from the questionnaire responses that 54% of the women would like their children to speak Dutch, 32% are indifferent and 14% would not like it; for men these figures are 36%, 43% and 21% respectively. But when it came to actually speaking, only 3% of the children in families with more than one child spoke mostly Dutch, 2% speaks half English - half Dutch, and the remainder spoke mostly or only English. These findings indicate a considerable difference between attitude and performance. Those second generation migrants who do learn to speak Dutch seldom acquire the proficiency of a monolingual Dutch speaker and so the process of language shift continues with smaller and smaller numbers maintaining Dutch as the dominant language at home. Moreover, while overall 28% of the first generation saw being able to speak Dutch as necessary in order to 'be Dutch', with women being more convinced of this than men, only 4% of the parents actually sent their child(ren) to special Dutch language classes.
2.1.3.1 Ambivalent factors

The 'ambivalent factors' mentioned above, when combined with other extra-linguistic factors such as social attitudes, perceived roles or motivation, can cause a language shift. One of Kloss's factors in this category of ambivalent factors, which is important in the case of the Dutch, is the similarity of native language and culture to those of the host society. Immigrants who are 'more similar' may find the acculturation process easier, and can spend more time and energy on language maintenance. On the other hand, it may be more difficult for them to maintain their separate ethnic identity than it is for 'less similar' immigrants. Physically the Dutch are not all that different from Anglo-Celtic Australians and the languages are very close. Of all the immigrant groups in Australia whose native language is not English the Dutch (and possibly the Germans) are culturally the closest to Anglo-Australians. The Dutch who arrived in Australia during the first twenty years or so after the Second World War, and who on the whole had less knowledge of the English language (23% had no knowledge of English compared with only 8% of the later arrivals) than more recent immigrants, arrived in a society which expected immigrants to assimilate. Nearly all these immigrants now speak more English at home than those who arrived later, despite the fact that more of the latter did have some or good knowledge of English at the time of their arrival (43% versus 38%). The combination of the attitude of the host society with factors such as having a similar cultural value system, being a comparatively dispersed immigrant group (no 'Sprachinseln' to speak of), and having a relatively low regard for the importance of the native language as a core value, has certainly contributed to the almost total language shift which has occurred within one generation.
2.1.4 Influence of linguistic factors

Much attention has been paid to the influence of linguistic factors on language shift and language death, but consensus has it that they are in general not as important as the 'non-structural' sociological, political and sociolinguistic factors (Weinreich 1953:5; Dressler and Wodak-Leodolter 1977). And as Swadesh has said: '...the factors determining the obsolescence of languages are non-linguistic.' (1948:234). Denison has argued that '... the direct cause of 'language death' is seen to be social and psychological: parents cease transmitting the language in question to their offspring.' (1977:22). Although many of these observations are pertinent to languages which are disappearing, or dying, some are just as relevant to language use among immigrant groups, especially those groups which no longer receive a regular influx of new arrivals. When there is no longer a purpose for a language, when it has lost most of its communicative functions, the motivation to teach it to the next generation disappears and the number of speakers will inevitably diminish.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 DATA

The data for this study come from questionnaires and interviews. The questionnaire, which was distributed first, was aimed at persons born in the Netherlands, who at the time of their arrival in Australia were sixteen or older. Questions were asked about year of arrival in Australia, place of birth and spouse's place of birth, educational and professional qualifications, use and command of both Dutch and English, satisfaction with issues concerning living conditions in Australia, club membership, issues indicating identification and national pride, and, last but not least, whether the respondent knew any English prior to arrival in Australia. The second source of data was an interview and some participant observation. As far as possible the interviewing was done in Dutch (but this depended on the informants). In the first part of the interview the informants were asked to describe several photographs, while the second part was unstructured, a more casual conversation about daily life in Australia, work, children's schooling, food, recreation, etc.

3.2 METHODS

3.2.1 The Questionnaire

Just before Christmas 1985 I distributed five hundred questionnaires to people
with surnames I knew to be Dutch, selected from the Canberra Telephone Directory. This could be done quite easily by looking for names starting with Nieuw-, Sch-, Oost- or with van or de followed by a non-French name, names ending in -berg, -huis, -kamp, -oorn, -wijk, -woud, names containing -ouw- and other typically Dutch letter-combinations. It was not as easy as I had first thought to get in contact with people born in the Netherlands by going to the Canberra-Dutch club, since only one-fifth of the members of the club are Dutch. The lists kept by the Dutch embassy are confidential and were therefore unavailable. All in all the telephone directory seemed to provide the best opportunity for selecting a random sample, if I could be sure that the chosen surnames were indeed Dutch.

A covering letter, explaining the purpose of the study, and a stamped return envelope addressed to me accompanied the questionnaire. At the end of the questionnaire I asked whether the respondent would be prepared to participate at a later stage in an interview. I hoped that indirectly this would lead to more reliable self-reporting of command of English and Dutch. Whether this had any effect I cannot say for certain, but the individuals I subsequently interviewed had certainly been correct in their evaluation of their English and Dutch language proficiency as reported half a year earlier.

Table 3.1 below shows what happened to these 500 questionnaires after mailing. After receiving the 212 questionnaires I coded them and keyed the data into a computer for quantitative analysis.

For a number of reasons the focus of most of my analyses has been the first generation migrants (G1). First, because at the age of sixteen speech patterns
are firmly established. Second, very few of the respondents belonging to the second generation had any active knowledge of Dutch and would therefore require a different research approach. Third, the division at the age of sixteen closely followed the cut off point used in the 1983 Language Survey by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and thus was advantageous for comparative reasons.

Table 3.1

Return rate of questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>questionnaires were returned with the addressee unknown or not in Australia at the time;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>questionnaires were not returned;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>addressees were not born in the Netherlands, but in South Africa or Belgium; a few of the addressees were Burghers (from Sri Lanka) and a few were Germans, who had dropped the final -f from -kampf;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>addressees were born in Australia of Dutch extraction (with a Dutch father or grandfather);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>usable questionnaires were returned; 154 respondents were 16 or older at the time of their arrival in Australia (hereafter called Generation 1 (G1)) and 58 were 15 years or younger at the time of their arrival (hereafter called Generation 2 (G2));</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Total questionnaires mailed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strictly speaking all 212 respondents were first generation Dutch because they were all born in the Netherlands. I am using an atypical meaning of the term 'second generation' on the grounds that hardly any of the younger arrivals had maintained any Dutch at all. Some sociological studies include those aged 5 or younger on arrival in Australia in the second generation (on the grounds that most of their primary socialisation occurred in Australia).

Of the first generation Dutch migrants only 17% had no knowledge of English on arrival in Australia, with slightly more women than men having knowledge of English than men, while 86% of the second generation did not know any English. Since in the Netherlands English is usually taught in secondary school, from year seven onwards, and the agespan of second generation Dutch was fixed at 15 years or younger, these figures are not surprising.

3.2.2 The Interview

Census and survey questionnaires rarely investigate language proficiency other than through self-reporting; nor do they provide data on the purity or correctness of the languages as spoken by the respondents. To be able to examine the influence of English on Dutch speech I needed linguistic data. For this purpose I held interviews with a subsample of the respondents who had returned my questionnaire. I randomly selected thirty people belonging to G1
(this represented 20% of the group), who did have or had had until recently a Dutch spouse or partner. This was important because language maintenance among the Dutch seemed to be virtually non-existent where the spouse or partner was not Dutch.

After some initial casual conversation I showed the informants six photographs, three Dutch and three Australian landscapes or city scenes, and then asked them to describe these pictures. I made it clear that it was not meant to be a test to locate the scenes, which was something the informants worried about. Within the constraints of the interview situation, where recording took place, it was possible to test the informants' command of both English and Dutch (being a Dutch-English bilingual, I was able to test both myself). Two speech styles were observed. One style was more casual, when we talked about personal experiences, life in Australia, food, trips back to Holland etc., than the other. When informants were asked to describe the photographs they used a more formal style of speech. This does not mean that the two speech styles used represented the informant's casual and formal speech style; rather they merely represented two styles in the person's speech register. There are many situations imaginable in which the same informant might produce a more formal or a more casual style, depending on the interlocutor, topic or setting, all of which are important factors when choosing a speech style or variety.

As much as possible I tried to transcribe the interviews, which on average lasted from one and a half to two hours, immediately afterwards, while much additional (observed) information was still fresh in my mind, for I did not make any notes during the interviews. Many informants were only too happy to have an occasion to speak Dutch, especially those who normally no longer had the opportunity to do so. I mostly interviewed the informants separately, although
sometimes there was another Dutch speaking person present, who would participate. The interviews were largely done at the informant's home, some at the informant's place of work and some at the Canberra-Dutch Club. After the transcription was finished I analysed the interviews to see to what extent the Dutch maintain their own language and how Dutch speech has been affected by contact with English. I also endeavoured to determine to what extent different speech varieties showing phenomena such as borrowing, codeswitching and transference occurred, and which parts of Dutch speech have been most affected by language contact.

3.3 MEASUREMENTS

3.3.1 The Questionnaire

From the 57 questions asked a number of variables have been selected from the questionnaire to try to establish links between respondents' background characteristics and language use and speech varieties, or in other words their actual speech behaviour. Variables which could be associated with different speech varieties are:

1. Knowledge of English prior to arrival in Australia.

2. Province and country of birth of self and spouse. It has been suggested to me by several respondents that it is necessary to distinguish between a number of the regions of the Netherlands. For some of the respondents the regional language was more important than standard Dutch (see below in 4.1.1). I will only mention these distinctions briefly, since the numbers involved are rather
small.

3. Sex.

4. Age.

5. Educational qualifications.


7. Reasons for coming to Australia.

8. Active use of Dutch at present (i.e. does respondent at present speak Dutch with spouse and/or with children and/or with friends).


10. The language used by the respondent's children to speak to each other.

11. The language used by the respondent to pray, dream, think, count or spell, or express anger.

12. National identification and identification with community values which are relevant to the language used, as measured by the following variables:
   - respondent's citizenship,
   - nationality of friends,
   - the necessity to speak Dutch in order to 'be Dutch',
   - does respondent consider him-/herself Dutch or Australian,
   - is respondent proud to be of Dutch origin,
   - membership of ethnic or non-ethnic organisations.

13. Satisfaction with living conditions as expressed through the following variables (rated on a scale from 1 -very satisfied- to 5 -very dissatisfied-):
   - respondent plans to live in Australia indefinitely,
   - respondent is satisfied with her/his work and its prospects,
with children's education and future, with the quality of life, and with the close friends he/she has.

3.3.2 The Interview

From the 154 first generation (G1) respondents a sub sample was randomly selected, from those respondents who had or had had a Dutch spouse or partner.

Previous research has shown that 'marrying outside the Dutch group' (Pauwels 1985:10) has a negative effect on the maintenance of Dutch. Pauwels states that for the Dutch it does not make much difference whether it is the father or the mother who has married outside the ethnic group (compared with other ethnic groups exogamy is very frequent among Dutch migrants, with 30% of first generation immigrants and 84% of the second generation marrying an Australian spouse, as is shown in Table 3.2). Nevertheless, it appears that in general women maintain their mother tongue better than men (see Chapter 2), possibly due to different assimilation processes and family roles.

(Table 3.2 about here)

Studies by Clyne, Harvey and Pauwels have shown that among Dutch migrants a complete language shift may take place in the first generation with a second generation who has only passive knowledge of the Dutch language. In inter-ethnic marriages, where neither of the partners has English as mother tongue and each speak a different language, Dutch is virtually unused in the nuclear family domain which, apart from the peergroup, for the Dutch is the most important domain for language maintenance. So in order to minimise the
possibility of language shift only those first generation respondents were chosen in this study who had, or had had a Dutch spouse for more than fifteen years.

TABLE 3.2

Country of birth of spouse/partner by generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth spouse/partner</th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 ACT data.

In this study persons arriving in Australia at the age of 16 or older are classified as belonging to the first generation (G1), while those younger than 16 at the time of arrival are classified as second generation (G2).
In total, thirty respondents were interviewed, representing 20% of those who returned a valid questionnaire. There certainly were problems in dealing with data taken from direct speech. Speakers made mistakes, would start a sentence all over again, and sometimes did not finish their sentences. Some even denied having made certain utterances until I played these back to them. It was important not to immediately attribute an 'incorrect' utterance made by a bilingual speaker to lack of command in the language used.

Analysis of the transcribed interviews has provided the linguistic data on the effect of contact with English on the Dutch language as shown in the presence of contact phenomena such as, according to 'pure' Dutch criteria, the 'wrong' use of prepositions, word order, and interjections in the two different speech styles of the informants. The interviews also showed the ways in which the informants borrowed from English, and switched from the one language to the other and back again in a particular speech situation.

The two different speech styles, in this case one more formal than the other, were analysed, in terms of pauses and hesitations, phonological features and the use of diminutives (extensive use of diminutives is a dominant feature of the Dutch language), which also serve as an index of language change.

3.3.3 The Questionnaire and the Interview

The next step was to investigate whether the occurrence of transference phenomena (I will call the effect of one language on another language, which results in features of one occurring in the other, transference. I shall come back to this phenomenon in Chapter VI) and the differences in speech styles and
language usage could be linked with some of the background variables from the questionnaire to determine whether sub-sets of speakers, who shared certain background characteristics, existed. Further, I wanted to find out what the Dutch actually do with their languages in a speech situation, with reference to a respondent's self report on their present command of Dutch. Thirdly, by correlating the respondent's national identification, length of residence in Australia and educational background with actual speech patterns, an attempt was made to see whether any ground could be established for the view that the Dutch (or possibly sub-sets of Dutch with particular characteristics) are monolingual (English speaking) migrants in Australia, and do indeed attach very little importance to maintaining their native language. At the same time it may be possible on the basis of these sociological and linguistic datasets to establish what members of the Dutch speech community consider to be the important criteria for being considered Dutch.
CHAPTER 4

THE DUTCH

4.1 IN THE NETHERLANDS

With well over 14 million people living in the Netherlands the total population now is only about one million below that of Australia. What, however, is not so similar is the average population density of the two countries, which was 426 per km$^2$ in 1984 for the Netherlands compared with an average density of 2 per km$^2$ for Australia. The relative size of the countries is shown in Figure 4.1. It was suggested by several of my informants that always having to live in such close proximity to other people has had the effect of making the Dutch relatively tolerant and conformist, since it is almost impossible to achieve anonymity (see in section 4.1.2 below).

(Figure 4.1 about here)

Although the first Dutch to set foot in Australia arrived in the early 1600s it was not until after World War II that mass migration from the Netherlands to Australia took place. The Dutch government, worried about over-population and the post-war economic situation in the Netherlands, was initially keen to develop emigration, especially of the agrarian population (Beyer 1964:214-5),
Figure 4.1

Maps of Australia and the Netherlands.

Total surface area of Australia is 7,682,300 sq. km
Total surface area of the Netherlands is 36,948 sq. km
because it wanted to develop industrialization (this lasted at least until 1953). Later the bulk of Dutch migrants were skilled and semi-skilled craftsmen and tradesmen, mainly in the building and printing industries.

In 1946 the government of the Netherlands entered an agreement with the Commonwealth for the introduction of migrants from Holland, and from that date thousands migrated to Australia, up to two-thirds with an assisted passage. Of the four countries open for migration to the Dutch, the USA, Canada, South Africa and Australia, Australia for most people rated last, mainly because the possibility of return, in case of emergencies for example, was very small due to the distance and thus the costs involved. While Canada was the recipient largely of Christian Reformed immigrants, Australia received predominantly Roman Catholics. The majority of these early migrants were motivated by a desire for economic self-improvement; a more adventure-oriented motivation arose in the sixties. The prospective migrants of the fifties were persuaded by the Dutch government's anxieties, they feared the changes expected to sweep Dutch society and decided to leave. Such migration in large groups ceased in the late fifties, when the economic situation in the Netherlands changed drastically and over-population no longer seemed such a threat. This explains some of the differences between the migrants of the fifties and the migrants of the sixties. I will return to this topic below in Chapter VII.

The peak years for Dutch migration to Australia, according to figures released by the Department of Immigration were 1952, with 16,769 arrivals, and 1951
and 1955 with 15,113 and 15,011 arrivals respectively (these figures include permanent and long-term arrivals only). Even in years when the number of immigrants was quite high the Dutch still dispersed after arrival in Australia. After 1960 the figures dropped enormously, and since then they have been steadily going down, except for a slight increase in the early eighties, as is shown in Table 4.1. In the sixties the economic situation in the Netherlands and in Europe had picked up, the social services in the Netherlands were very attractive, and this caused fewer people to migrate and many to return. Table 4.1 shows that settler gain, the total of arrivals minus the total of departures, has been relatively small since the early sixties for the Dutch.

(Table 4.1 about here)

For example, in the years 1964 to 1972 the majority of those returning to the Netherlands did so after a stay of two to three years, (between 12% and 17%), while hardly any migrants seem to have returned after a stay of ten years (Price and Pyne 1976:17). One has to bear in mind, however, that over 60% of Dutch settlers arrived in Australia on an assisted passage, which required a minimum stay of two years, otherwise the fare had to be repaid.

In the present study 80% said that they definitely planned to live in Australia for the rest of their life, 9% were likely to stay, 5% were not sure, and only 6% said no, they would not stay. These figures correlate strongly with length of residence in Australia, with the longer the period of residence the stronger the commitment to staying. The same trend has been shown by the figures released
Table 4.1

Arrivals (ACT (from 1975 onwards) and total Australia) and departures (total Australia) for settlers born in the Netherlands.

1949 - 1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>settlers arriving</th>
<th>former settlers departing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>total Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>12352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>15113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>16769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>10411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>12632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>15011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>13900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>10041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>9905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>11168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>12236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>4969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>3163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td></td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td></td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2188</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


N.B. Figures for the years 1949 - 1968, and 1975 - 1984 are based on the Netherlands as country of birth, while figures for the years 1969 - 1974 are based on Dutch nationality, due to a change in Census questions.
by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

4.1.1 The Language

The similarity between Dutch and English often seems to give Dutch speakers a false sense of confidence in their command of English, and as a result they treat the English grammatical system the same as the Dutch system. There are however big differences between the two languages, as will become evident in Chapter 6 below. The position of the verb is the most important factor in word order in Dutch. In declarative sentences the main conjugated verb always comes rigidly in the second place, following the subject (see 1) and 2) below), while in subordinate clauses it takes the last place (see 3) and 4) below). If in a declarative sentence the subject does not come first, but rather an adverb or a phrase, then subject and verb are reversed, so that the verb still comes second (see 5) and 6) below).

1) *Ik heb die film niet gezien*
   I have that film not seen
   I haven't seen that film

2) *Hij gaf het boek aan de leraar*
   He gave the book to the teacher

3) *Zij wist niet of zij de baan zou krijgen*
   She knew not whether she the job would get
   She didn't know whether she would get the job

4) *Ik denk dat ik morgen die film ga zien*
   I think that I will go to that movie tomorrow
While written Dutch is closer to spoken Dutch than written English is to spoken English as far as pronunciation is concerned, the differences between the various speech varieties in the Netherlands are far bigger than is the case, for example, in the United States. Dutch spelling is not as inconsistent as English spelling. In this century alone the norm for written Dutch has officially been changed three times in order to approximate spoken Dutch more closely. Regional speech differences, mostly in accents, are great. Everybody learns the local and standard variety. It is not difficult for the Dutch to recognise a person's speech as belonging to a particular province or even region. Even finer distinctions can often be drawn. It is also possible to distinguish between social classes, both in terms of pronunciation and grammatical usage. The difference between written and colloquial Dutch is bigger than in the case of English. There is much that can be written but sounds strange when said and vice versa. Thus when analysing informants' speech for the influence of English
on her/his Dutch it is important to contrast the data with the particular variety the informant would have been speaking in the Netherlands rather than standard Dutch.

Close to 75% of the Dutch speak English, since it is taught in most schools and English is often used on radio and television, and in advertising, as Figure 4.2 shows.

(Figure 4.2 about here)

Another important factor contributing to Dutch familiarity with English is that Dutch, especially since World War II, has adopted so many foreign, mostly English, words, and even whole phrases. It is therefore often impossible to make the distinction between a borrowed word and a loanword. Most of these now integrated words belong to technical language and the sports vocabulary. There has not been much resistance to this infiltration of foreign words into the language as, for example, has been the case in France, where l'Académie Française has occupied itself by worrying about the purification of French, and where articles are regularly published in 'Le Monde' about how to translate foreign (English) terms into French. Reinsma (1975) has put together a list of new words or new usages of existing words in the Dutch lexicon since 1945. This list contained 2,000 words! In Dutch foreign roots can be used to form verbs or adjectives, for example:

(1) shop-(p)-	extit{en} \quad \text{to go shopping}
Advertisements in the Dutch press in the Netherlands

Figure 4.2

"I treasure everything that is lively and beautiful."
Usually these words are produced as closely as possible to the perceived English pronunciation under the influence of the media (largely television). They are more widely integrated into Dutch by speakers with less education.

Most informants agreed that spoken Dutch seemed, at least to those who had been away from it for a while, to have become much less formal, and sometimes almost vulgar. Even an absence of only one to two years lead to an awareness of many new words.

### 4.1.1.1 Forms of address

Even forms of address are less strictly adhered to now than in the past. In Dutch, as for example in French and in Polish, one always had to make a choice between the less formal, more intimate je/jij and the more formal U (Dutch), tu and vous (French), and ty and pan/pani (Polish). This choice was determined by factors such as the addressee's age, social class relative to the speaker, or relationship, and familiarity with the speaker. Living outside a society where these rules are taken for granted and where one does not have to think twice before addressing someone who is older, or younger, or more respected, using the English form 'you' which requires no choice to be made, is very attractive. Having to use Dutch forms of address can often be confusing and even embarrassing for Dutch speakers in an English speaking environment.
Those Dutch migrants who have recently arrived in Australia often tended to use the informal forms of address where most of my informants who have lived in Australia for some time tended to still use formal forms. Most of my informants, when they visited the Netherlands, found it difficult to use the less formal forms of address, as there is now a tendency to use a more familiar, easier, speech variety in the Netherlands, which may well be the result of a society trying to be less class-conscious than it was before World War II, when many of the first generation migrants in this study grew up.

4.1.1.2 Diminutives

Another characteristic typical of the Dutch language which is apparently a little less used now, according to very recent arrivals from the Netherlands, is a fondness of diminutives. Diminutive forms are widely used in speaking to children as well as in speaking to adults. They convey mostly positive and favourable feelings, although they can carry some pejorative or sarcastic undertones, or even express contempt. Feelings of endearment, of wanting to take the edge off things, of kindness, humor, modesty, of nostalgia and many other emotions, can all be expressed by adding the very productive diminutive suffix to proper names, nouns, pronouns, numerals and adverbs. Thus the diminutive form conveys an attitude of the speaker towards a person or object(s), and does not necessarily indicate that the person or object is of a small size. On the other hand the deliberate omission of a suffix together with a particular intonation may show negative feelings, disapproval or sternness. Most of my male informants claimed they hardly ever used diminutives, some
even said it was typical of women’s speech. From analysis of the data, however, this did not appear to be correct. Men and women used diminutive forms equally often, and they mostly did so when talking about ‘things Dutch’, when describing the Dutch pictures, and in talking about food, the weather (which is a much cherished topic of conversation for Dutch people) and relatives. There was no difference in the frequency of diminutives used between ‘formal’ and ‘casual’ speech styles in these data.

4.1.2 National Characteristics

It is difficult to describe clearly the norms and values associated with ‘being Dutch’. Dutch children are generally taught to behave strictly according to the norms, to act ‘normaal’ and ‘gewoon’ (ordinary, common) and behave inconspicuously. Dutch people often are described as staunch individualists, people who cope by themselves, and as tolerant, hard-working and well-organised, with an interest in detail, a little boring, but also arrogant and somewhat opinionated, straightforward and blunt. Life for them seems to centre around the home and the family. The Dutch have two words for family: ‘gezin’, which refers to the nuclear family, and ‘familie’, which includes all the other relatives. Although house-ownership is relatively rare in the Netherlands, much time and money is spent on furnishings and decorating to make the home ‘gezellig’. ‘Gezelligheid’, which is virtually untranslatable, can apply to all sorts of things such as someone’s house or dress, sharing some smalltalk over a cup of coffee with the neighbour, an afternoon shopping with a friend etc.. It very much describes an atmosphere of cosiness, of feeling comfortable, and can
be seen as a core value for the Dutch, a characteristic element of their culture. It is something that is consciously maintained and regarded as important.

4.2 IN AUSTRALIA

The Dutch who came to Australia were not entirely representative for the population of the Netherlands. They were initially, immediately after the Second World War, mostly agrarian, mostly Catholic workers and later predominantly tradesmen and craftsmen. They came by choice and did not settle here in large groups. The decision to migrate largely for economic reasons this may well have contributed to a speedy adaptation and a greater 'willingness to fit in' than has been the case for migrants who came here for political reasons, as Smolicz and Wiseman point out (1971:5). Freedom of choice may also have had an effect on the retention of nationality, but this retention might also be a characteristic typical for the Dutch, as Taft has suggested (1961:274).

The Dutch dispersed widely over Australia, with a few small conglomerations, such as the bulb growers in the Dandenongs and workers for the Electricity Commission in the Latrobe Valley. A few small colonies were the result of religious ties, in Victoria, Queensland and Tasmania. Since they had mostly come for economic reasons, at least those who arrived here in the fifties, the Dutch were more concerned with getting on, working hard, and saving, often for a house, than with social activities. Initially they had little contact with other Dutch. But as the years passed and they improved their economic situation, they
became more interested in joining clubs and seeking the company of others of similar origin. Many of those early migrants now at the age of retiring would like to move to a Dutch old people's home. Their English comes less easily and they tend to switch frequently from English to Dutch, possibly a phenomenon associated with growing older (Clyne 1978). This was especially the case with migrants who had learned English at a later age. Because their children hardly ever speak Dutch and few new Dutch migrants come to Australia now, the Dutch speaking community is growing smaller and smaller, as Table 4.1 above shows. This trend is strengthened by the tendency of so many Dutch settlers to return to the Netherlands.

Thus the Dutch who only four years ago formed the fourth largest ethnic non-English speaking immigrant group (see Table 4.2) in Australia are now a rapidly aging group, which already is rarely mentioned as a separate ethnic group.

Dutch language classes have been organised only sporadically and on a very small scale. Dutch social clubs do not and never have attracted a large Dutch membership and hardly any members come from the middle-class. The national Dutch language newspaper the 'Dutch-Australian Weekly', which is published fortnightly, is, as far as I have been able to determine, the only ethnic paper with an English name. It has a small circulation of only 5,000. It is written in Dutch, but some transference does occur (see Figure 4.3). It seems that many of
TABLE 4.2

Number of persons for the five main non-English languages first spoken in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language first spoken</th>
<th>Number of persons</th>
<th>% of Total persons, aged 15 and over (N = 11,329,300)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>440,776</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>227,167</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>165,663</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>110,516</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>86,016</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
This table is based on data from the Language Survey conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in May, 1983. It covers persons aged 15 years and over.

Definition:
A non-English language first spoken is the first language a person spoke, even if this language now is no longer spoken nor understood.
the advertisements placed in newsletters, papers and magazines for Dutch readers in Australia center on food, furniture, sport and trips back home. I have found very few advertisements for lectures, the performing arts, language courses or fashion.

(Figure 4.3 about here)

However, even when Dutch migration was at its peak one could not have spoken about a Dutch speech community of any consequence. Many of the Dutch migrants, as is clear from Table 4.3, knew (some) English before they came to Australia.

(Table 4.3 about here)

It is not for nothing that the Dutch often have been called the 'invisible migrants'. They have not fraternised in communities like other ethnic groups, they assimilated very quickly and were independent. As one elderly woman put it: 'I just keep to myself; that way you don't cause trouble' (AIMA 1983:75). This was the attitude Australians expected from immigrants in the fifties and it was one of the reasons Dutch migrants were very popular. But now in the days of multiculturalism very few things Dutch have been maintained. Whether this is at all related to a perceived lack of ethnic identity is a question for which I do not have an answer.

Although the Dutch assimilated well many returned home and many declined to take out Australian citizenship. It has been mentioned above in 4.1 that return
Figure 4.3
Advertisements in the Dutch press in Australia

---

Advertisement for sale of three daags arrangement vrij-zat-zon for only $90 (room only) based on 2 persons. 3-daags arrangement vrij-zat-zon voor slechts $90 (room only) gebaseerd op 2 personen.

---

Sneefbuffet lunches voor zakenmensen; Afhaal service. Air conditioned comfort.

---

Super Deal
Speciale prijs naar Europa

---

Verdien hoge rente met ons Call Deposit Account

---

Reiskoopje van de week
The Holland Leisure Card for $12.00

---

For sale of Poffertjes Stoves

---

Bel Toll-Free voor een Reservering

---

7 Daagse Rijn/Main Cruise vanaf fl 725.

---

De eenigste echte Hollandse Club in N.S.W.
Kom eens een kopje koffie drinken (vrij)

---

VOOR ONZE NSW en ACT LEZERS ZIJN WE NU SLECHTS DE KOST VAN EEN "LOCAL CALL AWAY"
Table 4.3

Knowledge of English prior to arrival in Australia for first generation men and women (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>men</th>
<th>women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some knowledge</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no knowledge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 ACT data
rates for Dutch settlers have always been high. 'Up to mid 1973 the Dutch and
the Germans lost most settlers' (Price 1975:309). Reasons for these high
figures were the improved economic situation in the Netherlands, the very good
social welfare provisions there, the fact that politically Dutch migrants were
free to return (in contrast to many other settlers), and the fact that many came
to Australia out of a sense of adventure, especially in more recent times.
Some of these arguments may also explain why the Dutch often waited so long,
or never got around to, taking out Australian citizenship. Table 4.4 shows
naturalisation figures from the Census for 1976 and 1981 and from the present
ACT study for 1986. These figures and those in Table 4.5 show that the longer
Dutch migrants live in Australia the more they are inclined to be naturalised.
The 1986 figures in Table 4.4 also clearly indicate the influence of having an
Australian spouse on becoming an Australian citizen, while Table 4.6 shows the
importance of having an Australian spouse on the language used in the family
domain. Pauwels (1985:10) also found this, pointing out that: 'Marrying outside
the Dutch group reduces language maintenance to approximately half that in the
case of intra-ethnic marriages.'

(Tables 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 about here)

4.3 IN THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

According to the 1981 Census 1713 persons in the ACT were born in the
Netherlands. This accounted for 1.8% of the total ACT population. In terms of
## TABLE 4.4

Naturalisation figures for residents of the ACT (born in the Netherlands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naturalised*</th>
<th>1976 Census (N=1804)</th>
<th>1981 Census (N=1716)</th>
<th>1986 ACT (N=154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about it</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The question asked was 'Have you been naturalised?'
TABLE 4.5

Years of Residence by Naturalisation (percentages)
(N=154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naturalised</th>
<th>20 or less</th>
<th>21 - 25</th>
<th>26 - 30</th>
<th>31 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about it</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 ACT data.
TABLE 4.6

Whether English or Dutch or both languages are used in the family by spouse's country of birth (COB) by languages spoken between members of the family (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondent with spouse/partner</th>
<th>Respondent with children</th>
<th>Spouse/Partner with children</th>
<th>Children between themselves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>spouse's COB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2-1/2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 ACT data.

Note: Variation in the total number of persons, in this table and in table 4.7, is due to the fact that the number of children varies per family, and some are one parent families. In the questions the expression 'spouse/partner' was used, in these tables 'spouse' has been used for convenience.
variables such as occupation, income and education (the three elements of social status), naturalisation and language use, the Dutch in the ACT are very similar to the Dutch in Australia overall. Social status indicates a slight difference, with the ACT scoring higher than the remainder of Australia on all three variables. Language use at home and naturalisation figures are similar, but with women generally more reluctant than men to give up their Dutch nationality.

4.3.1 What does being Dutch in Australia mean?

How do the Dutch feel then about their country of origin; are they proud of being Dutch? It has been said above that Dutch culture is not a language-centered culture, and this is supported by findings from studies by Pauwels (1981:60), Clyne (1977b:6) and Harvey (1974:139). Not maintaining one’s native language does not necessarily mean that one is not proud of one’s country of origin. Nor does it necessarily indicate a propensity to assimilate. Many second generation Dutch, although they have no active knowledge of Dutch, do identify with their Dutch origin and still adhere to certain Dutch traditions. When respondents were asked whether it was necessary to be able to speak Dutch in order to 'be Dutch' most of those who had been here more than 30 years did not think it important, while those who had been here 20 years or less thought it important. This is shown in Table 4.7. The longer the Dutch live in Australia, the less they speak their native language, yet, many still feel proud of their origin.

(Table 4.7 about here)
TABLE 4.7

Is it necessary to speak Dutch, in order to 'be Dutch'?

by

length of residence in Australia (in years)

(percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of residence</th>
<th>20 or less</th>
<th>21 - 25</th>
<th>26 -30</th>
<th>31 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 ACT data
Since there is not much opportunity to develop and use Dutch, parents, viewing the issue in fairly practical terms, often did not consider it important for their children to learn to speak Dutch. They attached more importance to cultural traditions and thought these to be of great value. Thus losing one's mother tongue is not necessarily directly connected with a loss of ethnic identity. Language maintenance has never been a big issue with the Dutch, who rarely seize an opportunity to meet other compatriots. On the contrary, they often seem more inclined to avoid each other. In answer to the question whether they considered themselves to be Dutch or Australian, the majority of those who arrived here in the early fifties indicated that they regarded themselves more Australian than Dutch, while those who had arrived more recently saw themselves as both Australian and Dutch, or as mostly Dutch (see Table 4.8 below).

(Table 4.8 about here)

When asked whether they were proud to be of Dutch origin 72% answered: 'Yes', 2% said: 'No', and 26% said they felt indifferent. Slightly more women than men were proud of their Dutch origin.

Other research (Anderson 1979; Ross 1979; Trudgill and Tzavaras 1977) has also shown that loss of native language does not necessarily imply that pride in being of a particular origin is non-existent, or that ethnic identity no longer exists. Trudgill and Tzavaras, for example, found in their study of Arvanites, a
TABLE 4.8
Do you consider yourself Dutch or Australian?
by
length of residence in Australia (in years)
(percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of residence</th>
<th>20 or less</th>
<th>21 - 25</th>
<th>26 - 30</th>
<th>31 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch or Australian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely Dutch</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly Dutch</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly Australian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely Australian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 ACT data
linguistic minority in Greece, that 'language is not a necessary requirement for ethnic group membership' (1977:180) and their figures show exactly the same trend as the present study, namely, that over time it is considered less important to speak the language, but this does not necessarily lead to loss of ethnic identity. Young Arvanites exert pressure on their parents, just as the children of Dutch migrants do, not to speak the native language, especially in public. But as they get older they do feel more positive about the language. However, quite apart from feeling embarrassed by the language, many young Dutch people here would not even have enough knowledge of Dutch to be able to respond in it. Overall there was very little concern, except for the odd sentimental twinge, on the part of parents about which language their children used.

Graphs C and D in Figure 4.4 show how little active knowledge second generation Dutch have of their parents' mother tongue.

For the first generation having an Australian spouse has a big influence on active language skills. Graphs A and B in Figure 4.4 illustrate this point.

(Figure 4.4 about here)

4.3.2 Use of Dutch reading and audio-visual materials.

Knowing that for the whole of Australia only 5,000 copies of the Dutch-Australian Weekly were published I was curious to find out how many people make use of Dutch reading and audio-visual materials, and how many
FIGURE 4.4
Command of English and Dutch of First and Second Generation Dutch

The Dutch in Australia and New Zealand are not a speech community, but cannot be considered to enjoy Dutch foods and heritage. My informants particularly enjoyed to enjoy Dutch foods and heritage. Much of this has been passed on to the younger generation.

The fact that many of the Dutch are able to speak English is not to be seen as an indication of their feelings towards Australia. It is important to distinguish between assimilation and loss of ethnic identity. These are two different social processes. The language loss of the Dutch makes many an indicator of the assimilation, but rather of a sense of pragmatism: the need to be understood.

The second generation has less command of Dutch than the first generation. It is not surprising to find that women read more frequently (Dutch) than men (1984:48).
actively used Dutch in writing etc. Figure 4.5 shows that reading and writing letters represent by far the most use of Dutch.

(Figure 4.5 about here)

Here again, having an Australian spouse reduces the use of Dutch drastically. On watching television it has the opposite effect. In general women have more contact with Dutch than do men, but not through television and radio. Pauwels also found that: 'women read more frequently (Dutch) than men' (1981:65).

4.3.3 Assimilation and Satisfaction

The Dutch in Australia must be regarded as an ethnic group, for although they are not really a speech community, they certainly do have a cultural identity regardless of the ease with which they assimilated as individuals in the past. Their houses usually show a clear identity. I saw wall lamps and standing lamps, wallclocks and small, typically Dutch objects, trinkets (snuisterijen). My informants particularly seemed to enjoy Dutch food items. Much of this has been passed on to the younger generation.

The fact that many of the Dutch are able to speak English is not to be seen as an indication of their feelings towards Australia. It is important to distinguish between assimilation and loss of ethnic identity. These are two different social processes. The language loss of the Dutch need not be an indicator of their assimilation, but rather of a sense of pragmatism. It would only be
FIGURE 4.5

Use of Dutch - both active and passive - material (Percentages)

legend:
- having an Australian spouse (N=43)
- having a Dutch spouse (N=93)
- women (N=50)
- men (N=104)

Note: the questions read as follows: "Do you read in Dutch any of the following?" (books, journals, magazines)
"Do you write in Dutch any of the following?" (letters)
"Do you watch or listen to any of the following in Dutch?" (television, films, radio)
possible to infer more from these data if comparable data were available for other ethnic groups. Unfortunately I have not been able to obtain data for knowledge of English prior to arrival for other ethnic groups.

I thought that satisfaction with personal prospects in Australia might bear a positive relationship to assimilation. In order to test whether the high degree of assimilation of the Dutch could be explained in terms of satisfaction with Australia and its conditions, I asked respondents to indicate their degree of satisfaction in relation to five issues. They indicated their satisfaction or dissatisfaction, on a scale of 1 (=very satisfied) to 5 (=very dissatisfied) for relating to work prospects, children's education and future, the quality of life and having close friends. Table 4.9 shows the percentages of men and women satisfied and dissatisfied with these issues.

(Table 4.9 about here)

Men were slightly more satisfied than women with most items, with the exception of 'having close friends'; here more men were dissatisfied. Overall few people were dissatisfied and high levels of satisfaction would certainly help people to quickly assimilate. Satisfaction would increase the desire to stay and might even help individuals to identify more with Australia.
Table 4.9

Satisfaction with life in Australia for men and women (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(very) satisfied</th>
<th>(very) dissatisfied</th>
<th>men</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>men</th>
<th>women</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. your work and its prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. your children's education</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. your children's future</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. quality of life</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. having close friends</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 ACT data

Note: Variation in the total number of persons is due to the fact that not all respondents have children.
CHAPTER 5

THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH ON DUTCH

5.1 CONTACT PHENOMENA

When languages come in contact with each other, which happens for example when: '...they are used alternately by the same persons' (Weinreich 1953:1), changes in both languages are likely to take place. Both languages may be affected in their phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon. However, in a language contact situation where one of the two languages, say language X, is clearly the language of the dominant or host culture and the other, language Y, the language of the dominated or recipient culture, language Y (also called the base language) will undergo the most change. In this study I shall only address changes in the Dutch language (the language of the dominated culture) as spoken by first generation Dutch immigrants in Australia, and not the influence of Dutch on their English (the language of the dominant culture).

Bilingualism seems to be one of the logical consequences of migration to Australia for the Dutch. They seem to be able to make use of both languages in order to achieve the most efficient form of communication by switching between Dutch and English, and by borrowing from English, depending on topic, interlocutor, place or setting. But as time goes by English will increasingly...
become the dominant language and Dutch will lose more of its functions, becoming more and more simplified and stilted, particularly its spoken form. In general the lexicon shrinks and transference (see below, Chapter VI) from English increases. My informants' speech had retained forms and a vocabulary which were current when they left the Netherlands but now are somewhat dated. My informants were only too aware that this was the case, and each time they visited the Netherlands they became more aware of it. Nevertheless, most of them soon adjusted and soon felt more confident in speaking Dutch. Reading the newspapers, etc., never posed any problems.

In a language contact situation, lexical performance is often the area of speech first affected (Haugen 1956:59, 1972:177; Shaffer 1978:265; Clyne, 1982:95) followed by syntactic performance. If the languages are very similar it will often be harder to keep the lexical items apart and easier to make substitutions. Some speakers may reach a state where they speak both languages at a level which would be unacceptable to a monolingual speaker of either, sometimes even to the extent where a single phoneme is produced as a cross between an English and a Dutch phoneme. This was the case with a few informants who had some prior knowledge of English and who used one sound for the English dental fricative /θ/ and the Dutch alveolar stop /d/. But overall these speakers were able to communicate just as well using their own individual speech variety.

Thus when languages come in contact with each other it affects the linguistic behaviour of the speakers, and this may be determined by linguistic or extra-linguistic factors, or a combination of both. The effects can be classified as: borrowing, code-switching, code-mixing and transference. Although listed
here as separate categories, it is not always possible to draw a strict
distinction between them and to label the data obtained accordingly. The
various types of transference (see Chapter VI) indicate how the phonology,
morphology, syntax and lexicon of one language has been changed in the speech
of bilinguals through contact with the other language.

5.1.1 Borrowing

Borrowing is a rather widespread and not clearly defined term which in some
studies has been replaced by the terms interference (Weinreich 1953:1) and
transference (Clyne 1967), which are not two terms for one concept (see
below, Chapter VI). Borrowing which involves language use rather than language
structure can be seen more as a performance strategy and is not as much a
learning process as is structural transfer (Corder 1983:92). It does not
necessarily imply a certain amount of competence in more than one language. If
an item is already well accepted in the speaker's native language (what Haugen
calls 'established loans' (1956:40)), as is the case in Dutch with many English
lexical items, such as, for example, 'cocktail' or 'kit', then use of such an item
is not an instance of borrowing. In this study I will only regard as borrowing
the use of a simple lexical item which belongs to the English language, and has
not yet been established in the Dutch language, and which may or may not have
been integrated phonologically or morphologically into the native language. This
assumes that Dutch has the necessary sounds for the pronunciation of the
borrowed word if it is not adapted (integrated). The use of unadapted
borrowings does not arouse as much of a negative attitude among the listeners
or participants as structural transfers, or borrowings which have been adapted.
Many of my informants were tolerant of this use of English lexical items when
listening to Dutch speech, but not so of structurally transferred items. For example in a conversation with a group of informants one of them remarked:

(1) *Ja, dan moet ik toch eerst eens even m'n husband gaan ring-en.*

Yes, in that case I will first have to give my husband a ring.

When asked later the other informants said that it was alright for this speaker to use 'husband', but to use an English verb and give it a Dutch suffix was going 'a bit far' and generally they disapproved of this type of speech variety.

Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez in their Chicano study (1978:278) also found that extreme code-switching, in the middle of a sentence, for example, 'is held in disrepute'.

In the present data the majority of borrowings from English were not integrated; they were not assimilated to the phonology and/or morphology of Dutch. Of all borrowings, 8% were integrated, with verbs more often being integrated than other parts of speech, and 92% were not integrated. Overall, nouns were borrowed by far the most frequently (67%) followed by interjections (the part of speech that kept its original form the most) (16%), adjectives (9.5%), verbs (5.1%) and adverbs (2.4%). These figures are comparable to those Haugen (1970:447) obtained for the different parts of speech in American Norwegian. His percentages were nouns (75.5%), verbs (18.4), adjectives (3.4%), adverbs and prepositions (1.2%) and interjections (1.4%). The biggest difference is for the interjections. However Haugen mentions that he used 'available lists of loanwords' (1970:446), while my calculations are based on transcribed conversations. This may explain some of

*underlining= English lexical items in Dutch text from my data.
the discrepancy between these figures. Maybe the willingness of the Dutch to become part of the Australian culture increases their disposition to intersperse their speech with these interjections?

Studies have been conducted to see whether universal acceptance levels exist for the use of alternate languages in the duration of one conversation, and whether some speech communities have a more tolerant attitude than others to the use of two languages alternately, to borrowing, switching and mixing. Differences do apparently exist as Mackey (1976:312) has pointed out, with exposure to other languages or other speech communities being associated with greater tolerance. This could be one of the reasons contributing to the ease with which my Dutch informants alternated between, and mixed, English and Dutch.

Borrowing as defined above can be a speech behaviour which is not necessarily restricted to bilinguals. Monolinguals could also be borrowing in this sense when using lexical items from another language. Borrowing can often be seen as the very beginning of the transition from monolingualism to bilingualism. It is necessary to distinguish between two types of borrowing. Firstly, borrowing may occur out of a need for a word or concept. This means that the speaker borrows a lexical item, usually at the vocabulary level, because no such word exists in the native language for the concept that he or she wants to talk about. The alternative would be to translate the word into Dutch, which could often be quite lengthy, because it could require the use of a subordinate clause and therefore a change of sentence construction. There are not too many examples of this kind in my corpus, but examples of borrowing out of necessity include the following:
(2) Zoals je hier in Canberra in een subrub woont hè....
*Just like you live here in Canberra in a suburb....*

(3) Dat zijn die eieren van wespen op een gumleaf.
*Those are wasp eggs on a gumleaf.*

(4) En ik heb gewerkt met die imperial measurements, ik heb metric geleerd op school natuurlijk...
*And I am used to working with imperial measurements, of course I learned metric in school....*

(5) Vroeger waren er geen zucchinis, marrows en dat soort dingen en pumpkins en sweet potatoes...
*In the early days there were no zucchinis, marrows and such things and pumpkins and sweet potatoes....*

Secondly, although a Dutch word may exist, borrowing might take place for reasons of speech efficiency, because the English word is the word that first springs to mind and is thus economical, and most people when they speak like to be economical. The use of borrowed words can also indicate a degree of the speaker’s acculturation, showing that he or she is involved in a language learning process in a culture contact situation. Examples of this type of borrowing are:

(6) Waar je sla kweekt onder het glas, hoe heten die dingen ook weer....
glasshouses....oh ja...kassen.
*Where you grow lettuce under glass, what are those things called again...oh yes..glasshouses.*

(7) Waar mensen hun eigen waren verkopen, zoals bijvoorbeeld hun
eigen pottery.

Where people sell their own wares, as for example their own pottery.

(8) Ik heb daar een paar units gedaan, toen kwam ik hier en heb ik het hier afgemaakt, tien units.

I did a few units there, then I came here and I finished it, ten units.

(9) Hoe noemen ze die building ook weer hier achter?

What do they call that building again here out the back?

My reservation of the term borrowing for word-borrowing, which can take place at any level but occurred mostly at the vocabulary level, is very similar to the usage of Reyes, who sees borrowing only as involving single words which may be 'spontaneous (not adapted) borrowings' (in Grosjean 1982:308) or 'incorporated borrowings' which are morphologically adapted. Dutch speakers tend to pronounce words borrowed from English as closely as possible to how they perceive them to be pronounced in English. My use of the term borrowing differs from that of Haugen (1953:65; 1956:40) and Hasselmo (1970: 180) who see adaptation, phonologically and/or morphologically, as crucial in making a distinction between code-switching (where no adaptation to the base language has taken place) and integration (= borrowing, where adaptation has taken place). They also agree that the length of the lexical item involved, may be anything from a single word to a sentence, while I prefer to distinguish between the use of a single word (= borrowing) and the use of longer unadapted lexical items such as phrases and sentences (= code-switching). In my corpus longer integrated stretches of speech were not present.
5.1.2 Code-switching

Haugen sees code-switching as occurring '...when a bilingual introduces a completely unassimilated word from another language into his speech...', and for precision distinguishes three stages of diffusion from one language to another: 'switching', the alternate use of two languages; 'interference', the overlapping of two languages, and 'integration', the regular use of material from one language in another, so that there is no longer switching or overlapping' (1956:40).

Code-switching behaviour is mostly the result of functional or external factors (sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic and pragmatic), such as the interlocutor (who must always know the same languages as the speaker, since code-switching would otherwise lead to a communication breakdown), topic, domain, type of interaction and setting. I could not test the importance of these external factors rigorously in one interview situation, but code-switching seemed to increase when the situation was less formal, and the informants felt more relaxed or became more enthused about a topic.

Code-switching may also be the result of linguistic or internal factors such as triggering. In a discourse between Dutch-English bilinguals lexical transfers and triggerwords (these can be proper nouns, nouns, verbs, discourse markers such as 'and', 'and so on', 'for instance', 'well', or bilingual homophones) can determine the language used for the utterance preceding or following the triggerword (anticipational or consequential triggering, a distinction made by Clyne (1967:84-89)). Although English and Dutch have many morphemically similar words which could act as triggerwords, triggering was fairly rare in my data. Consequential triggering occurred particularly rarely, which might be an indication of how speakers plan their sentences. When it did occur it was
mostly before or after proper nouns, especially after place names, and after loanwords (words transferred from English with their original form and meaning, which Clyne has named 'morphosemantic transfers' (1967:91-94). For example:

A) anticipational

(10) die gebouwen daar, it is Paddy's Market, ... al die gebouwen, it is Melbourne, Hobart...

those buildings there, it is Paddy's Market,... all those buildings, it is Melbourne, Hobart....

(11) dan ben je hier net zo goed een target met Pine Gap

in that case you are just as much of a target here with Pine Gap

(12) I used to go jogging, elke dag, nou doet ik maar een keer per week.

I used to go jogging, every day, now I do it only once a week.

(13) van de week was ik nog ergens, want ik was involved in arousal therapy, dat is een man die had een ongeluk gehad.

just this week I was somewhere, because I was involved in arousal therapy, that is man who had had an accident.

B) consequential

(14) Lake Ginninderra... it is a bit like it... ik zou niet kunnen zeggen waar het is.

Lake Ginninderra... it is a bit like it ... I could not say where it is.

*underlining= switch from Dutch to English

bigger print= triggerword
In this study code-switching includes the mixing of different codes within constituent boundaries in a conversation, and the changing from code to code between constituent boundaries, often used for stylistic (extra-linguistic) reasons. When analysing my informants' speech samples I could not always make a distinction between samples where two codes were used alternatively and samples where a mixture of both languages is used due to homophony. Much shifting from one language to the other in a conversation can be likened to very extensive borrowing, some of it integrated and some of it not, which may render a conversation virtually unintelligible. This was the case with two of my informants and intelligibility was made even harder by the fact that their Dutch phonological system was very much influenced by the English system.

Examples of code-switching:

(16) Meestal praten wij engels en soms op mijn werk, *I am supervising quite a large group of people*, gebruik ik een nederlands woord.  
*We usually speak English and sometimes at work, I am supervising quite a large group of people, I use a Dutch word.*

(17) Nou dat zijn mensen die in een *mall* lopen, *and David Jones is on the*
left and Williams the Shoeman on the right, moet ik er nog iets anders over zeggen?

Well those are people walking in a mall, and David Jones is on the left and Williams the Shoeman on the right, should I add something else?

Examples of code-mixing:

(18) No de Westertoren is more spitser, when you go met de boot in de gracht dan they tell you you see the smallest house van Europe, ja. But you can't see it hieraan.

No the Westertoren is more spiry, when you go by boat through the canals they tell you you see the smallest house of Europe, yes but you can not see it here.

(19) Het is een tentje, het is bij die building waar Jerry used to work, the Treasury you mean. Oh hoe heet dat ding nou zo gauw.

It is a small stall, near the building where Jerry used to work, the Treasury you mean. Oh what is it called again.

(20) Nou nee, never ever, nee echt daar zijn feelingen bij, ik ik feel dat in/in this society, which is an English society, we should speak English.

Well no, never ever, no really that involves feelings, I I feel that in this society, which is an English society, we should speak English.

As the above examples clearly illustrate, it is not always easy to make the distinction between code-mixing and code-switching. For this reason I have treated them here together and have left the distinction a tentative one.
Both code-mixing and code-switching seemed to happen automatically and speakers were mostly unaware of it happening. When it happened each code maintained its own phonological and morphological features. As Hasselmo has said: 'Ideally they are distinct successive stretches of two languages.' (1970:180), adding that 'imperfect code-switching' may occur when 'the phonologies and/or morphologies of two languages overlap within a given stretch of speech' thus he distinguishes between 'clean' and 'ragged' switching. An example where the shift from Dutch to English is not perfect is utterance (20). 'Feelingen' could be taken as a 'ragged' switch or as an integrated borrowing. The speaker did not switch to English until later in the sentence.

For code-mixing a similarity between the languages can be seen as even more important than for code-switching, although both processes require a command of the grammatical systems, a knowledge of the syntactic rules. Code-switching when it occurred intra-sententially in these data usually happened between constituents, so it seems that it could possibly be rule-governed by this constraint. Certainly '... they (code-switching strategies) exhibit some form of linguistic patterning' (Gumperz 1976:14). In the present study most code-switching took place at phrase structure boundaries. Syntactic constraints seemed to be the most significant. Gumperz found (1976:34) that code-switching was limited to certain constraints such as the coordinating conjunction constraint, by this he meant that coordinating conjunctions must belong to the same language as the second of two conjoined sentences. However, I found that my data based on conversations was not very suitable for a detailed analysis of constraints. It might be easier to analyse a written text for such purposes. On the other hand many of the changes in the
recipient language caused by code-switching are bound to occur only in conversation, since the interlocutor plays an important role. The more formal a conversation, because of the topic, the setting, type of interaction or interlocutor, the less likely it is that code-switching will take place. This certainly seemed to apply in the present, within the constraints of the limited variation in external factors it included.
CHAPTER 6

TRANSFERENCE PHENOMENA IN DUTCH SPEECH

When languages come in contact with each other an effect on both languages spoken can usually be observed, since most bilinguals find it virtually impossible to keep the two completely apart. This results in the introduction into the language of foreign elements which Weinreich (1953:1) has described as 'instances of deviation from the norm of either language', and has labelled as 'interference phenomena', which can be of a phonological, morphological, lexical or syntactic nature. Weinreich distinguishes between interference in speech and interference in language. The latter focuses on elements which: 'have become habitualized and established', while the former refers to new occurrences in speakers' utterances (1953:11).

Clyne, in his thorough study of bilingualism and language contact (1967 and 1972), has used the term 'transference' to describe 'the adoption of any elements of another language' (1967:19) and uses the term 'transfer' in relation to the actual examples of transference. I will use Clyne's terminology since it is useful and has less negative connotations than the term 'interference'.

The occurrence of transference seems to be more frequent and widespread if the two languages in contact are similar in structure, as is the case for Dutch and English. It is this degree of similarity in structure which determines linguistically the type and amount of transference from one language to the
other. The type and amount of transference are also determined by social and cultural factors. Topic, interlocutor, setting, and type of action are important influences, as well as individual variables such as education, age, knowledge of English, and level of satisfaction with life in Australia. Especially the latter can lead to a greater desire to acculturate.

When transferred elements are permanently present in the native language due to repeated use they can be regarded as having been integrated into the language of the speakers. Thus integration is the second stage after transference. Denison (1977:20) observes that 'massive interference brings about rule gains and rule losses. It tends to substitute where possible the rules of interfering languages for those of interfered with languages.' As Clyne has pointed out (1972:14) 'There are two factors relevant to a discussion of the place of transferred items within the system of the recipient language - type of integration (phonological, morphological, semantic, graphemic) and degree of integration-...' The degree of the integration of the transfers can be measured along a continuum, ranging from no integration at all to total integration (1972:20). The language of the Dutch migrants in my study, who have lived in Australia for fifteen years or more, showed a considerable amount of integration and, for speakers with less education, code-switching. It is different from the Dutch of the more recent arrivals. It is, however, still a viable language variety and it fulfills all the communicative needs of the speech community.

The degree to which a transfer is integrated remains the choice of each individual speaker. In this context the above mentioned variable 'knowledge of English' and particularly knowledge of English phonology, causes great variation between speakers.
6.1 LEXICAL TRANSFERENCE

Lexical transference is the most common type of transference, and of all lexical items nouns are the most often transferred. Possibly because the lexicon is less structured than the phonological and the syntactic systems nouns are the most likely part of speech to retain their form after transference. Especially when informants were talking about their Australian experiences relating to work and leisure, and the Australian way of life, much lexical transference took place. It is necessary to distinguish here between common nouns and proper nouns, since speakers have no choice in the case of proper nouns these are more likely to act as triggerwords. Lexical transference is illustrated by the following:

(Transfers from English have been underlined)

A) Nouns:

1) Ik ben dus een teacher op een school.
   *So I am a teacher in a school.*

2) Zoals je hier in Canberra in een suburb woont hè.
   *Just like you live here in Canberra in a suburb hm.*

3) Mijn zoon is een lawyer, hij heeft ook een degree in ekonomie.
   *My son is a lawyer, he also has a degree in economics.*

4) En nou, in mijn old age pension, ik heb zoveel kennissen hier.
   *And now, in my old age pension, I do have so many acquaintances here.*

5) Dat is een of ander terrein ...een picnic/picnic area, daar achter huizen.
   *That is some sort of terrain, a picnic area, with houses behind it.*

6) Australisch eten is wel makkelijk hoor, gewoon een chop en een
steak.  
Australian food is quite simple, just a chop and a steak.

B) verbs:

7) En kroketten, zo lekker, die taste -en zo goed.  
And croquettes, so yummy, they taste so good.

8) Dat is weer aan een strand waar ze aan het jogg-en zijn.  
This is a beach again, where they are jogging.

9) D'r is zo'n vrucht en die is geloof ik ook related to de tomaat ook.  
There is a fruit and I think that it is related to the tomato too.

At present they are taking on guestworkers again, but that will change again.

11) Daar in Holland, daar de buurvrouw rule -t de straat.  
Back in Holland the neighbour rules the street.

12) Ik ik prepare een brief hier in mijn hoofd in het Engels, maar ik schrijf hem in het Hollands.  
I I prepare a letter in my head in English, but I write it in Dutch.

C) pronouns:

13) Het lijkt op een industrieterrein, ik denk dat this hier kassen zijn.  
It looks like an industrial area, I think that this here are glasshouses.
D) adjectives:

14) Als het in Holland is dan is het een of ander meer, like een natuurbad of zo.

If it is in Holland than it is some lake or other, like a sun-beach or so.

15) Nee, dat is niet de Lijnbaan, nee die is niet zo civilised, nee gut zeg.

No, that is not the Lijnbaan, no it is not that civilised there, oh no.

16) In Den Haag om kwart over tien in lijn drie, daar zit toch niemand in, ik vond het spooky, bah.

In the Hague at a quarter past ten in bus 3, there is nobody at all, I found it was spooky, yuk.

17) De problemen die hun hebben, die hebben wij niet, wij hebben net de opposite problemen.

The problems they have we don't have, we just have opposite problems.

18) Er is maar een safe combinatie.

There is only one safe combination.

E) adverbs:

19) Ja, basically eten wij wel veel Nederlands, aardappelen, groente en een stukje vlees.

Yes, basically we eat a lot of Dutch food, potatoes, vegetables and a bit of meat.

20) Ik ben erg blij, at last zaten we dan met vijf kinderen, twee van hem
en drie van haar.

I am very happy, at last we were together with five children, his two and her three.

21) Die Limburgers, noem ze alsjeblieft geen Hollander either.
   Those Limburgers, please don’t call them Dutch either.

22) Nu is ze vorig jaar in December unfortunately gestorven.
   Well unfortunately she died last December.

F) conjunctions:

23) Ze zijn eigenlijk bang voor alles daar in Europa, de wereldoorlog, de politiek, or... or... veel meer dan hier.
   Actually they are afraid for everything there in Europe, world war, politics or or much more so than here.

24) Dat is een terrein voor voetgangers, and eh het is een groot winkelcentrum.
   That is an area for pedestrians, and eh it is a large shopping centre.

G) interjections:

25) See, je blijft dan toch wel Hollands eten he.
   See, you do continue to eat Dutch food.

26) Nou, waar gaan we nou naar toe, hey wait a moment, ik kan het niet lezen, wat staat daar nou?
   Well where are we going now, hey wait a moment, I can’t read it, what does it say there?

27) Nee, daar kan ik niet veel van zeggen, ’t is groen, so, ’t zal wel zomer
No I can’t say much about it, it is green, so, it must be summer.

28) Toch eten wij veel Nederlands, you know.
   We still eat a lot of Dutch food, you know.

29) Die heb ik niet teruggestuurd, right.
   I did not send those back, right.

6.1.1 Integration

Although the lexical transfers in the examples 1) to 29) above are given using English spelling this does not mean that they were also all pronounced in English. I have not given the phonetic transcriptions of the transfers here, because the great majority of the items are not integrated and the pronunciation attempted was what the speaker saw as being as close as possible to observed English pronunciation. Thus many transfers are not at all affected by phonological integration, they remain completely unchanged. However, some transfers have undergone a phonological and/or morphological integration. Of all lexical items, verbs and adjectives are most often morphologically integrated in these data, as has been indicated in Chapter 4.

Trager and Valdez (in Peñalosa 1982:57) have suggested that the length of time the speaker has been exposed to English is reflected in four stages. The first stage is the phonetical adaptation of loanwords, the second is the use of unadapted forms, the third is the use of loan translations and partial adaptation, and the fourth stage is the dropping of the receding language. These stages were all recognisable in my informants too.
6.1.1.1 Grammatical Integration.

Examples 7), 8), 10), 11), 17) and 18) given above show how several Dutch speakers integrated these items by adding Dutch morphemes to English items. In 7) tasten, 8) joggen and 10) downtrickelen are all infinitives formed by adding the Dutch infinitive ending -en {~}. In 17) opposite [ˈpɒsɪtɪv] and 18) safe [ˈseːfə] both have the Dutch ending {ə} of the modifying adjective.

An English noun transferred into Dutch has to be given a gender by the speaker. The gender assigned may depend on the degree of the speaker's acculturation, on homophony or the meaning of the noun in question. For example in 66) below de paper is used because of the paper in English. The correct Dutch expression here would have been het artikel (neutral).

Gender assignment and plural forms in these data generally were hardly ever integrated. The only exception was the assigning of non-neuter gender to a few nouns which are neuter in Dutch, such as the beach (in Dutch het strand), and the army (het leger) in the following examples:

30) Bij iedere beach moesten we stoppen.
   At each beach we had to stop.

31) Op elke beach moesten we een foto maken.
   On each beach we had to take a picture.

32) En de manier waarop die mensen op de beach zitten.
   And the way people sit on the beach.

33) Onze oudste zoon is in de army.
   Our eldest son is in the army.
Only once did an integrated plural form occur:

34) Boerekool koop je uiteindelijk alleen nog maar in tin-nen.

Borecole you can only buy in tins as yet.

A few examples of a Dutch diminutive ending added to an English noun occurred:

35) Ik zit in de bouw, in het staal, en dan heb je een beam-pje, weet je.

I am in the building industry, steel, and than you have a small beam, you know.

36) Rode kool koop je hier eigenlijk alleen maar in een tin-netje.

Red cabbage you buy here only in small tins.

6.1.1.2 Compromise Forms

Few speakers combined an English component with a Dutch component thus creating hybrid forms also called 'loan blends', for example:

37) filing-kabinet

38) nacht-mare

39) wedding-taarten

Typically these newly created compound nouns are not given the required medial sound that is normally fitted between the constituent parts.

6.1.1.3 Proper Nouns

Proper nouns are rarely phonologically integrated in these data. Indeed
integration sometimes goes in the opposite direction, with Dutch proper nouns being adapted to English, as for example when informants talked about Amsterdam ['æmstædæm]. Informants whose surname started with 'van' often adapted this to [væn] so that it would not be mistaken for the German 'von'. Overall the adaption of surname and graphemic integration went in the other direction. Many Dutch-Australians no longer write 'van' separate from the rest of their surname. These are signs of strong acculturation.

6.2 PHONOLOGICAL TRANSFERENCE

In the interviews with my informants it was the phonological transference from Dutch to English that was the most noticeable, although some transference in the other direction did occur. Lenneberg (1967:181) develops the theory that after the age of approximately 11, the area of the brain which is involved in phonological processing decreases in plasticity due to maturation, and native accents emerge in the second language. According to his theory late bilinguals are thus likely to interpret and reproduce the sounds of a language learned later on the basis of the phonological system of their first language, which helps to explain why phonological transference is so hard to overcome. In my interviews some phone-substitution did take place, but only in one case was this so prominent that it almost resulted in non-intelligibility.

Many informants used one phoneme, which represented a compromise between the two phonemes of the two different languages. Weinreich (1953:19) describes phone-substitutions as 'applying to phonemes that are identically defined in two languages but whose normal pronunciation differs.' In general,
Dutch articulation, which is lower and further in the back of the mouth, with vowels which are less palatal than those of English, and more widespread front-roundedness, has resisted phone-substitution, particularly among speakers who are relatively unaware of the English phones or have less command of the English phoneme system. In Dutch the voiceless stops p, t, and k, are unaspirated, but under the influence of English some aspiration did occur in the speech of these informants.

The most common examples of phonological transference in this corpus are the transference of the alveolar fricative [s] which replaces the dental [r], the transference of diphthongs, and the bilabial [w] which replaces the labiodental fricative [v]. The extent to which these types of transference are integrated in speech varied with the individual, but it is in general rather rare.

6.3 SYNTACTIC TRANSFERENCE

In spoken conversation it is not always clear when an utterance should be regarded as syntactically incorrect for linguistic reasons and when it is incorrect for extra-linguistic reasons. In the speech of many informants who spoke a dialect it was often impossible to distinguish whether what a Dutch monoglot would see as a deviation from standard Dutch should be seen as a transfer from English or as a particular dialect variety. In order to be able to analyse the many speech varieties I used the speech of some informants who had only recently arrived in Australia for comparison, their speech has been indicated as the correct form.
The influence of English on Dutch syntax is obvious in the following types of syntactic transference:

A) word order:

i) Many informants generalised the SVO order in declarative sentences. In Dutch the verb has to occupy the first, second or last place, depending on whether it is used in a coordinate or subordinate clause, a declarative sentence or a question. Dutch is very rigid in this. The verb dominates the sentence. Examples of incorrect word order are:

40) Zijn er veel Hollanders, die U ontmoet, die geen hollands spreken meer?
    Correct: Hebt U veel Hollanders ontmoet die geen hollands meer spreken?
    Are there many Dutch people you meet who don’t speak Dutch anymore?

ii) Often informants would bring discontinuous constituents, acceptable in Dutch but not in English, closer together. In Dutch the participle occupies the final position in the sentence.

41) Ik heb het gekregen van de nederlandse ambassade.
    Correct: Ik heb het van de nederlands ambassade gekregen.
    I have received it from the Dutch embassy.

42) Ze hebben dat gemaakt speciaal voor mensen die ......
    Correct: Ze hebben dat speciaal voor mensen gemaakt die ......
They have made that especially for people who...

43) Ik weet dat er zijn ontzettend veel dingen die ik doe die typisch nederlands zijn.

Correct: Ik weet dat ik ontzettend veel dingen doe die typisch nederlands zijn.

*I know that there are many many things I do that are typically Dutch.*

Adverbs of time precede adverbs of place in Dutch, while English clauses start with adverbs of place followed by adverbs of time. In both languages adverbs of manner, if present, will stand between the other two adverbs. Thus for Dutch the order for adverbs is: 'time', 'manner', 'place', while for English the order is: 'place', 'manner', 'time'.

44) We gaan naar een vergadering eens per maand.

Correct: Eens per maand gaan we naar een vergadering.

*We go to a meeting once a month.*

B) use of auxiliary:

Dutch often makes use of the verb 'to be' as well as of the verb 'to have' as the auxiliary in compound past tenses, unlike English which only uses 'to have'. In the perfect tense the auxiliary 'to have' and the past participle do not normally stand next to each other, and this caused some transference. It would seem plausible that under the influence of English the use of 'to have' as an auxiliary, albeit incorrect would have increased. However, many informants overused 'to be' rather than using 'to have'.

45) Ach dat was zo ontzettend, iedereen is (replace: heeft) zo in angst
gezeten.

Dear that was just dreadful, everybody was so worried.

46) In Holland als dat kassen zijn, dan zijn (replace: hebben) ze ook geen seizoenen nodig.

In Holland, if those are greenhouses, they don't need seasons.

47) Zijn tweede vrouw is (replace: heeft) veel gereisd, haar vader is een naval attachee.

His second wife has travelled widely, her father is a naval attachee.

48) Ik heb water in mijn oor, want ik ben aan het zwemmen geweest tussen de middag. (correct: want ik heb tussen de middag gezwommen).

I have water in my ear, because I went swimming at lunchtime.

49) Ik ben hier niet uit vrije keus gekomen, ik heb (replace: ben) gewoon mijn man gevolgd, that is all...

I did not come here by free choice, I simply followed my husband, that is all....

50) Of dat nou zo is omdat ik in Holland heb (replace: ben) opgegroeid.

Whether that is so because I grew up in Holland...

C) deletion of reflexive pronoun:

English does not make use as often as Dutch of reflexive verbs. A number of Dutch verbs always need an object, and this is the reflexive pronoun when the subject acts upon him/her-self. Examples of such verbs are 'zich herinneren', 'zich thuis voelen'.

51) Een echt polderlandschap, met allemaal mooie rechte akkertjes en zo, mooie wegen die ik (insert: me) zo goed kan herinneren.
A real polder, all nice straight fields, good roads I remember them well.

52) Maar als ik (insert: me) kan herinneren wat de meeste mensen zeiden.....
   But if I remember well what most people said....

53) Ze wilden hollands spreken om (insert: zich) een beetje thuis te voelen.
   They wanted to speak Dutch in order to feel a bit at home.

D) prepositions:

Learning to use prepositions correctly can be one of the biggest problems when learning a foreign language, since these are a particularly idiomatic part of speech. Because Dutch and English are very similar and a few prepositions are alike phonemically but different in meaning, considerable confusion can result. This type of transference could also be discussed under semantic transference. Many prepositions have a homophonous equivalent with a different meaning in the other language, and some are also partially synonymous. I have included the correct preposition (which was used by the recent Dutch arrivals) in the following examples in brackets.

54) Ja daar staat een kist met appelen van (uit) Tasmanie.
   Yes there is a crate of apples from Tasmania.

55) Waarom hij zich in (op) de achtergrond houdt weet ik niet.
   Why he keeps himself in the background I don't know.

56) Ik mag de Dutch Australian Weekly graag lezen, ik zag het meestal op (in) Civic.
   I enjoy reading the Dutch Australian Weekly, I usually saw it in Civic.
57) Ik sprak net met iemand die in Nederland was met (tijdens) dat Chernobyl accident.

I just spoke to somebody who was in Holland during the Chernobyl accident.

58) Die Hollanders leven in een voortdurende angst, angst van (voor) Rusland, en dat er gestolen zal worden, ja angst van stelen (dat men bestolen wordt).

Those Dutch live in constant fear, fear of Russia, and that something will be stolen, yes for stealing.

59) Ja een typisch hollands landschap, van een toren uit (af) gezien.

Yes a typically Dutch landscape, seen from a tower.

In Dutch the preposition follows the noun when expressing a movement in a certain direction, towards something or someone, while in English the preposition precedes the noun. This English construction was often transferred by my informants. As for example in (60).

60) Alle kinderen kwamen tegelijk op het toneel (op).

All the children came onto the stage at the same time.

E) question tag:

The so commonly heard question tag: 'is it?', 'isn't it?', 'does (s)he?' was translated by a few informants in: 'heeft het?', 'heeft het niet?', 'doet hij/zij?'

61) Nou dit is de Lijnbaan, is het?

Well this is the Lijnbaan, is it?

62) D'r zijn weinig plaatsen waar je zoveel mensen bij elkaar ziet, zijn het niet?
There are few places where you will see so many people together, aren't there?

63) Gisteren bakte mijn dochter lekkere kroketten. Heeft ze niet?
   *Yesterday my daughter baked some nice croquettes, didn't she?*

64) Jij hebt toch een dochter op de middelbare school, heb je niet?
   *You have a daughter in high school, haven't you?*

The most common types of syntactic transference in these data are the SVO generalizations in statement sentences, perhaps because in the type of speech solicited in the interviews declarative sentences predominated. Next most frequent was adding incorrect question tags, followed by adverbs in the wrong position and incorrect prepositions. Table 6.1 shows the percentages for each type of syntactic transference. These figures indicate the per cent of the cases where a particular type of syntactic transference occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Syntactic Transference</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVO over-generalization</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding of question tags</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing together discontinuous constituents</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial wordorder</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When languages are very close, as are English and Dutch, homophonous forms and partial synonyms from one language can be easily transferred, in meaning only, to the other language. Many pairs of homophonous words with unrelated meanings exist between the two languages, and when English lexical items were transferred confusion was sometimes caused. Items might be correctly translated, but used incorrectly in Dutch. For example in English one can 'grow flowers and vegetables', but in Dutch 'groeien' is an intransitive verb. It is correct to say in Dutch 'de tomaten groeien vlug' (the tomatoes are growing fast), but 'wij groeien tomaten' (we are growing tomatoes) is not correct. It should be 'wij kweken (cultivate) tomaten'. These were common errors resulting from the homophony and semantic similarity between the English verb 'to grow' and the Dutch verb 'groeien'. An obvious example of semantic transference, already discussed above in 6.3, is the use of prepositions, especially before geographical names.
Certain expressions may seem perfectly obvious to the speaker yet cause malcommunication if they rely on an extended or contracted meaning, from the point of view of one language, of the item in question. This occurred regularly.

An example of an extended item is 'stem' meaning 'voice' and 'vote' in Dutch and 'spoor' meaning 'spur' and '(railway-) track', 'trail', 'trace'. An example of contracted meaning is 'hospital' meaning 'military hospital' and 'ziekenhuis=hospital' or 'letter' meaning 'letter, of the alphabet' and 'brief=letter'.

Haugen has identified three types of semantic transference: 'synonymous', 'homologous' and 'homophonous diamorphs' (1956:47), where he explains diamorphs as being 'interlingually identified variants of morphemes or groups of morphemes' (1956:46). Meanings were being transferred from English to Dutch, while Dutch forms, some grammatically more correct than others, are being used. This was so common in the speech of the first generation Dutch migrants that it had become productive. In these data occurrences of semantic transference were often preceded by hesitations and pauses, indicating that speakers were aware that something was not quite correct. Several types of semantic transference occurred, and they can be grouped as follows:

A) partial homophony and partial synonymy

In such cases the Dutch and English words sound similar but share only part of their meaning.

65) Zulke artikelen sluit ik in in mijn letters naar Holland (letter=letter; de brief=letter).

I enclose this type of article in my letters to Holland.

66) Je kunt verwijzen naar de paper geschreven door......(het papier=paper;
You may refer to the article written by.....

67) Als ik een nederlands woord gebruik, dan kijken ze me helemaal blank aan (blank=white; blank=blanco, wit, onbeschreven, used for paper but not for faces).

When I use a Dutch word, they look at me blankly.

68) Als ik met andere Nederlanders spreek, dan heb ik echt moeite als het snel gaat (spreken=to speak; praten=to talk).

When I talk with other Dutch people, I have trouble when it goes quickly.

69) Mooie wegen en een hazige horizon (heig=hazy; haze=waas).

Nice roads and a hazy horizon.

70) Ze hebben nu al verschillende malen gedacht om hem nu maar op te heven (opheffen=raise, abolish; heave=opheffen).

Several times now they have considered abolishing it.

71) Is het vrij dan, wordt daar niets aangedaan? (vrij= at liberty; free=gratis).

Is it free, and is nothing done about it?

72) Die mensen zijn aan het rennen met een hond aan het leidsel (rein=teugel, leidsel (of a horse), riem (of a dog); to lead=leiden).

Those people are jogging with a dog on a lead.

73) Ze hadden een echte nodd om nederlands te spreken (nood=necessity; need=behoeft)

They had a real need to speak Dutch.

B) (partial) homophony

74) Als je de map van de wereld hebt kun je Holland amper zien. (map=map, map=blanco, map=carte, map=pagina)
stationery-case, file; map=landkaart).

*If you take the map of the world you can hardly see Holland.*

75) Ze had een echt goed gevoel voor *humeur*. (humor=humor; humeur=mood).

*She had a real good sense of humor.*

**C) partial synonymy**

76) Soms heb ik een *[klein]* idee dat sommige mensen zich ertegen verzetten (klein=little; just as English uses 'some idea', or 'an idea' and not 'little idea', so Dutch uses 'enig idee' and not 'klein idee').

*Sometimes I have an idea that people object to it.*

77) Legendes schijnen niet meer zo in de mode te zijn, de meeste mensen *weten* ze niet. (kennen=to know, be familiar with people and stories; weten= to know, be familiar with facts).

*Legends don’t seem to be popular anymore, most people don’t know any.*

78) Hier in Australië *weten* (correct: kennen) ze je alleen maar bij je voornaam.

*Here in Australia one only uses first names.*

79) Ik probeer echt om de juiste nederlandse woorden te vinden, dat vind ik ontzettend *[voornaam]*. (voornaam=prominent; important=belangrijk).

*I really try to find the right Dutch words, I feel that is very important.*

**D) loan translation caused by homophony and synonymy**

80) Dat zijn van die *glashuizen* waar ze groente in verbouwen.

*(kas=glass-house; glas=glass, huis=house).*
Those are glasshouses used for growing vegetables.

81) Ik sprak alleen maar een beetje school-engels toen ik uitkwam. (uitkomen=come out (used with flowers, issue, or newspaper), emerge; to come out= aankomen).

I only knew some school English when I arrived here.

82) Nou begrijp ik het, dat is dan als meer oververanderd. (veranderen= change, alter; change over=omzetten).

Now I understand it, that has been changed into a lake.

83) Ik geloof dat als je een besluit maakt om te gaan emigreren dan moet je de taal leren ('een besluit nemen'= to make a decision (literally 'to take a decision')).

I feel that if you have decided to migrate you should learn the language.

84) Wat me altijd weer verbaasd is dat ze er mee wegkomen (wegkomen= get away in the sense of clear out; get away from something=eraan ontkomen).

What always surprises me is that they get away with it.

85) Misschien heeft het te doen met de bloementeelt (has to do with=heeft te maken met).

Maybe it has to do with growing flowers.

86) Hier liggen ook nog andere boten, dat zijn huisboten (houseboat=woonboot, woonark).

Here are also some other boats, those are houseboats.

Types A) and D) of syntactic transference, word order and preposition, seemed to occur particularly in the speech of those who did not speak Dutch regularly but were determined to make an effort. When an English lexeme is (partly)
homophonous and (partly) synonymous with a Dutch lexeme, semantic transference becomes likely. Apart from the prepositions mentioned above, semantic transfers were predominantly nouns and verbs, and a few adjectives. None of these transfers were used because there was no Dutch equivalent, but rather because it was the first lexeme that sprang to the mind of the speaker, maybe because the correct form had been forgotten. In general those who made an effort to speak Dutch, and who enjoyed the opportunity, preferred to use semantic transfers rather than lexical transfers. Clyne has pointed out that this type of transfer may result 'from a deliberate effort, on the part of adults and children alike, to avoid morphosemantic transfers.' (1967:105). All semantic transfers were pronounced as regular Dutch lexemes, and since Dutch forms were used they were integrated as a matter of course.

6.5 PROSODIC TRANSFERENCE

In Dutch polysyllabic words have the stress on the first syllable of a word, unless this syllable is an unstressed prefix. This is very similar to the general rule in English, where the stress also falls on the first syllable, but both languages have a shifting stress. Because the stress patterns are largely similar, and whenever differences did occur they were not transferred by my informants, it was not possible to analyse prosodic transference. A few informants transferred the rising intonation, typical of Broad Australian, at the end of a statement, but this happened only in concurrence with other types of transference, or when the informant switched codes. However, it was altogether very rare and therefore does not justify more than a mere mention.
6.6 TRANSFERENCE OF DISCOURSE MARKERS

Hasselmo has pointed out that until 1970 transference, called 'interference' by him, had been studied 'in terms of units functioning on the sentence-level or on lower levels of analysis' (1970:179). He was the first to extend this research to include transference at discourse level. In his analyses Hasselmo distinguished between positions of discourse segments within a given discourse and their content and/or function. He pointed out (1970:183) that discourse segments are 'either content units or discourse markers', and that a distinction should be made between 'those discourse segments which the speaker formulates anew in the course of a speech event and those which are preformulated'. The former he called nonce-forms and the latter linguistic routines. Many 'preformulated routines' occurred in my interviews.

Transference of discourse markers did occasionally lead to code-switching. These discourse markers were used in addressing, greeting, or leave-taking exchanges, when discussing the weather, and often occurred at the beginning of the interview. In dividing the discourse markers in my data into three groups, according to their function, I am utilising Hasselmo's three types of functions of discourse markers.

Discourse markers may be used to:

i) sentence-initially link different types of content units into larger units and, but, anyway;

ii) keep open the channel between the interlocutors you know, you see, listen, wait a moment, hang on;
iii) to signal specific types of content units or something like that, for instance, and so on.

In my data many types of discourse markers occurred. Clyne has pointed out that the transference of discourse markers could well be interpreted as "lexicalised filled pauses" (1972:30), and I would agree with that. Due to a large amount of homophony *en/and*, *wel/well*, *so/zo* and the total integration into the lexicon of standard Dutch of *sorry*, and *okay* it was often difficult to decide whether the speaker was using a Dutch or an English word. However, there were other examples which were more explicit.

Examples of transference at discourse level:

A) **speaker links own utterances**

87) Mijn zoon is geen aardappeleter. And, als ik dan in Holland kom, dan vind ik het zalig, *en/and* dan heb ik vaak een tweede *helping*.

*My son is not a potato eater. But when I go to Holland I love it and I often have a second helping.***

88) En dan zeggen ze wie is daar en dan gaat de buitendeur open. And oh verschrikkelijk...oh heavens...en dat gezeur en dat gezanik.

*And than they say, who is there, and the frontdoor opens. And oh terrible...oh heavens...that fuss and bother.*

89) Nee, hollands spreek ik eigenlijk nooit meer. So, nee zij sprak alleen maar engels, maar dat engels is niet te best.

*No I hardly ever speak Dutch anymore. So, no she only spoke English, but that English was not so good.*

90) Het ligt eraan hoe oud je was toen je hierheen kwam. *Wel/well, that is/is* interessant.
It all depends how old you were when you came here. Well that is interesting.

91) Toen gingen we naar tante Jo, and whatever, en toen gingen we naar Brussel.

After that we visited aunt Jo, and whatever, then we went to Brussels.

92) Ik dacht dat dat een Italiaan was, die daar, ..... oh eh that is it... ja.... maar het is toch in de zomer genomen.

I thought it was an Italian, that one there, ... oh eh that is it... yes... but it must have been taken in the summer.

B) expressing agreement

93) Nee dat is de markt in Hobart, in Tasmanië.

Oh, toch, yeah, isn't it lovely!

No that is the market in Hobart, in Tasmania. Oh yeah, isn't it lovely!

94) Ja, okay, maar dat zijn van die woorden die ik in het engels trouwens ook niet ken.

Yes okay, but those are words I don't know in English either.

95) Wij zijn een keer naar Zandvoort geweest, en daar sprak je dan een heel jaar over, ja de wereld was toch klein, that is right.

Once we went to Zandvoort, and that was something you would talk about for a whole year yes, the world was small, that is right.

96) Nou ja, okay, zoals ik gewoon praat dus.

Well yes, okay, just like I speak normally.

97) Yeah, het lijkt of er iemand met een cello zit.

Yeah, it looks as if somebody is sitting there with a cello.
C) expressing strong agreement

98) Het was dus een leuke vakantie?
Oh shit yeah, fantastisch!
So it was a nice holiday? Oh shit yeah, fantastic.

D) marking the end of a sentence, and/or putting all doubt aside

99) We trokken van de ene plaats naar de andere en ik kon dat ding toch niet kopen anyway.
We travelled from one place to another, but I could not buy it anyway.

100) Op het ogenblik nemen ze weer een hele boel gastarbeiders aan, maar dat zal wel weer downtreakelen I suppose.
At present they are taking on guestworkers again, but that will change again.

101) Dat zijn tien, eh nee, 3,000 schapen, not bad.
That are ten, eh no, 3,000 sheep, not bad.

102) Well, well, .... het water is te groen, Brabant hè, echtwaar, shit!
Well, .... the water is too green, Brabant hm, really, shit!

103) Ik ben hier niet uit vrije keus gekomen, ik heb gewoon mijn man gevolgd, that is all!
I did not come here by free choice, I simply followed my husband, that is all!

104) Ik ben niet zo met die Amsterdammers ingenomen, maar ja, d'r zijn ook wel goeien en kwaijen, that is right.
I don't like the Amsterdammers that much, but, well there are good ones and bad ones, that is right.
E) opening a new section

105) Let's see, ja net zoals het uitvalt hoor, aardappeltjes met een juutje erbij, dat bevalt me best.  
Let's see, well whatever, potatoes with gravy, I rather like that.

106) Wel/well let's see is/is het de Bodensee, ik wou eerst zeggen dat dit Italië was.  
Well, let's see, it is the Bodensee, I first wanted to say Italy.

107) Wel/well that is/is een markt, nou ik kan niet zeggen waar het is, maar het is dus wel een markt.  
Well that is a market, but I cannot say where it is, but it sure is a market.

F) pause filler, hesitation marker

108) Het lijkt op een industrieterrein, ... I think... eh...hmm...ergens in het Westland.  
It looks like an industrial area,...I think eh... hm somewhere in the West.

109) Ze zeggen juist altijd dat Holland heel erg like Hobart is, and eh I see..  
They always say that Holland is much like Hobart, and eh I see...

110) Volgens mij zijn het dennebomen, in ieder geval... and ... eh.. zo te zien is het Holland..  
According to me they are pinetrees, in any case...and...eh...it must be in Holland.

111) Dit zijn boerderijen, die hebben een eigen ... hold on ... bit of land around it.
This are farms, they have their own...hold on...bit of land around it.

112) Een heleboel woorden die ben ik nooit tegengekomen, so/zo die weet je dan niet ... you know...
Many words I have never heard, so I don’t know them, you know...

113) Oh dat zijn... hey wait a moment .. het is hier in Australië, hoe kan dat nou, het regent.
Oh those are...hey wait a moment...it is here in Australia, how is that possible, it is raining.

114) Dat is eh eh, Williams the Shoeman, that is eh let's see, eens even kijken.
That is eh eh, Williams the Shoeman, that is eh let's see, let's see.

115) Wait a minute, de Hoge Veluwe? Nunspeet, nee dat is meer die kant heen...
Wait a minute, the Hoge Veluwe? Nunspeet, no that is more that way..

116) En dan laat je de rest staan .. oh hang on ...hang on ...oh I see..ik kan er maar eentje meenemen.
And than you leave the rest ..oh hang on.. hang on.. oh i see ..I can only take one.

G) keeping the channel of conversation open

117) Voor ons om een goede mop in het Engels te tappen valt nog niet eens mee, .. you know... nee, want je kunt ze niet vertalen.
It is not easy for us to tell a good joke in English, .. you know... no, because you can't translate them.

118) Je neemt die levensstijl aan hè ...it is exciting.... you know... in het begin hou je vast aan dat hollandse.
One adapts to that lifestyle hm ..it is exciting ...you know.. in the
beginning you hang on to things Dutch.

Thus it seems that here in these data most of the discourse markers are preformulated, with the same ones recurring time and time again. Markers expressing agreement far outnumber those expressing disagreement. Neither positive nor negative markers are hardly ever transferred; the Dutch *ja* and *nee* are used almost always. Those informants who were determined to try to speak correct Dutch made a lot less use of discourse markers than those who were not particularly worried about how they spoke. In this they resemble those informants who used a lot of code-switching, and who also tended to make little use of transfers at discourse level when they used Dutch as the base language.
In chapter three, section 3.3.1, I mentioned several variables which I thought may possibly have an effect on the speech behaviour of Dutch immigrants. Analysis of the data in this study indicated that of all the variables a person's educational background is the variable which correlates most strongly with fluency (I will explain in 7.1 how I computated the variable 'fluency' and how informants were given a fluency-score). The correlation coefficient measuring the degree of relationship between these two variables is .67. Knowledge of English prior to arrival, which is strongly related with years of education has a correlation coefficient of .40. Other variables having substantial relationships with fluency are: 'whether the informant speaks Dutch at home' (.35) and length of residence (.49). The other variables in the analyses do not show any significant relationship with fluency or with a particular speech variety marked by more or less transference of any kind. It is important to keep in mind that the numbers in some of the cells used in crosstabulating these variables were very small. Another problem with these data was that of the accurateness of responses to retrospective questions in the questionnaire, since I could only check the command of language skills of those thirty respondents, who became my informants, when I interviewed them. However, what could be checked, the active command of English and Dutch, corroborated the responses given by my informants.
7.1 FLUENCY SCALE

After analysing the language of my informants I created a 'fluency' scale in order to give each informant a score. This score, which can be taken as an index of language maintenance, enabled me to correlate a speaker's language maintenance with extra-linguistic factors such as years of education, period of arrival in Australia, length of residence in Australia, feelings of national identification, whether the informant speaks Dutch at home, and gender.

Each speaker received a score for the amount of transfers used, for each type of transfer used, and a score for being able to communicate effectively in Dutch. From these scores a final score was calculated for each informant on a ten-point scale. A score of ten meant that the speaker spoke fluent Dutch, a speech variety resembling that of my control-group (this control-group consisted of respondents who had recently arrived in Australia from the Netherlands), with no transference phenomena. While a score of zero meant that the speaker in question did not speak viable Dutch, or, in other words, was hardly intelligible in Dutch.

Figures 7.1 and 7.2 are scattergrams, showing the datapoints where the coordinates of the points (where an asterisk * indicates a single case (=informant) falling in this position, or a number if two or more cases fall in the same position) are the values of the variables under consideration. For Figure 7.1 the variables are fluency and education (measured on scale of 0 to 9, where 0 means less than 10 years schooling, and 9 means having a Ph.D). For Figure 7.2 they are fluency and number of years of residence.
I then calculated correlation coefficients to indicate the degree to which change in one variable (for example: education) is related to change in 'fluency', and to be able to compare the strength of relationship between 'fluency' and one variable and 'fluency' and other variables.

7.2 EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Dutch migrants arriving in Australia have in general been well educated, with a large proportion having high educational qualifications. Of the thirty informants in this study eight had no more than ten years schooling or less while thirteen had a tertiary qualification of some sort, ranging from a bachelor degree to a PhD. The other nine had at least ten years of schooling and often a certificate, associate diploma or a diploma, usually in a trade or craft. Six of my informants had no knowledge of English prior to arrival in Australia. Knowledge of English is clearly linked with number of years of education prior to arrival in Australia, since those who have stayed at school in the Netherlands past year seven will usually have had English as a subject. After fifteen years or more in Australia one-half of my informants still spoke some Dutch, mostly at home and/or with friends, but hardly ever with their children. Whether my informants still spoke Dutch now correlated significantly with 'having a Dutch spouse' (.36), with having a high score (a score of 7 or higher) on my 'fluency' scale (.35), and with 'feeling mostly Dutch' (.37). Speakers who are confident that their Dutch is a viable speech variety tend to use it more interchangeably with English than those who are less confident.
FIGURE 7.1

Scattergram of datapoints for educational qualification and fluency for all informants.
Scattergram of datapoints for years of residence and fluency for all informants.
Those older informants who are now living alone would very much like to be able to speak Dutch with their child(ren). However, many parents had deliberately started speaking English with their children at the time these first started going to school. Unless they had sent their children to Holland when these were older, or had made a concerned effort to introduce Dutch at home as the main language of conversation, and these were very few, they could not speak Dutch with them. Overall the better educated parents seem to use English more often than the others at home and with their children, apparently, so they told me, because they feel equally adequate in both languages. Yet parents with more education placed more importance than others on the maintenance of Dutch culture and language, they enjoyed speaking Dutch and certainly could see an advantage in being able to do so. However, they regarded it as an advantage to be able to speak any language other than English, not necessarily just Dutch.

Educational background is an important variable, because education often provides people with the ability to pay more attention to speech, although some people are obviously more language-oriented than others. Because of the economic spelling system of Dutch, in which an almost one-to-one relationship exists between spelling and pronunciation, many less educated Dutch were unaware of the lack of it in English and persisted in using one pronunciation for a particular vowel, diphthong or consonant. Awareness of possible different speech varieties and norms may create a sensitivity towards language use and this became evident in the adjustment of some informants to different interlocutors on a number of occasions. Informants with more education generally worried less about their ability to speak Dutch in the event of visiting the Netherlands. Seeing themselves as having two languages and being
part of two cultures, they all felt they would be fluent, at least in the speaking
of Dutch, after a few days of exposure to the language. All respondents in the
category of ten years or more education had a very good command of all four
language skills in both Dutch and English. They also had more contact with
Dutch TV, radio, film, books, magazines etc. There was not much difference
between the two groups in terms of the language used for praying, counting and
thinking, while the group with more education used English slightly more for
expressing anger and for dreaming. Being part of two cultures was extended by
fewer well-educated respondents than others to taking out Australian
citizenship (64% versus 85%). They were also less certain about staying in
Australia permanently and tended more often to express indifference when
asked whether they were proud to be of Dutch origin (23% versus 31%), despite
saying more than the other group that they felt more Dutch than Australian
(34% versus 19%).

Greater fluency in both languages may make intra-sentential switching
possible, because syntactic knowledge is necessary in order to avoid violation
of the syntactic rules of the two languages. Overall, the better educated
informants used many lexical transfers, but they did not often integrate these
transfers. Less syntactic transference occurred in the speech of informants
with more education and this applied also in the case of semantic transference.
But they did use English often, and more education appeared to correlate
directly with greater use of English. Intra-sentential code-switching rarely
occurred. If it did it was nearly always at the immediate constituent level, and
was usually frowned upon by those present. Hidalgo, in her study of attitudes to
code-switching in Juarez, a city on the Mexican-U.S. border, also found that
code-switching was regarded unfavourably (1986:215).
Some of my informants with a good educational background had acquired the Broad Australian phonology and I even heard the rising intonation a few times during my interviews. Clyne noticed this also, particularly among displaced persons who were 'working in temporary menial jobs in order to establish themselves' (1970:126). This, as Clyne pointed out, involved combining a higher sociolect of their native language with a lower sociolect of Australian English. This was not the case for informants in the present study, they were people who felt very much at home in Australia and demonstrated this in their speech variety.

All informants regularly used transfers at discourse level, with educational background being of no consequence. Code-switching, however, occurred more often in the speech of less educated informants. A few informants had a very negative attitude to the Netherlands, its culture and its language, and regardless of educational background they did not object to the use of multiple transfers or code-switching at all.

Having more education does indeed contribute to language maintenance. Even though in actual fact English was used more often than Dutch by informants with more education they were, nevertheless, more fluent than the informants with less education. Those Dutch migrants with more education did, in principle, feel that it was important to maintain Dutch, but they did not have strong feelings about the use of Dutch in relation to national identification. To the contrary, they felt that it was not at all important to be able to speak Dutch in order to 'be Dutch'.

7.3 PERIOD OF ARRIVAL IN AUSTRALIA

I have used this title rather than 'length of residence in Australia' for this section because it seemed more important to distinguish between Dutch migrants who arrived in the late forties and fifties and those who arrived in the sixties, than to only look at length of residence in Australia. Length of residence does, as one would expect, have an influence on fluency as is shown in Figure 7.2, with more years of residence contributing to a lesser fluency. It is therefore important to see whether other distinctions can be made. The significant differences between the two groups of immigrants mentioned earlier lie in their outlook as immigrants and the attitudes of the host society at different points in time. A crucial difference between these two groups relates to their reasons for coming to Australia. I have mentioned in Chapter 4 that economic reasons were predominant for those who emigrated in the fifties, and overall that was the case for the first large migrant groups leaving the Netherlands soon after the Second World War. All Dutch migrants came by choice, which may have led to attitudes towards assimilation and acculturation different to those of ethnic groups who came here as political refugees. The migrants who left the Netherlands in the sixties left often more in an adventurous spirit; they were still keen to improve their living conditions and to provide opportunities for their children, but the economic situation in the Netherlands was already improving and there was less economic urgency about their decision to emigrate. Since for the migrants of the fifties the improvement of their economic position was an important motive, these parents were also keen for their children to have the best chance of success and they were therefore concerned that their children would attain a good command of English. Most children do understand some Dutch, and some speak it
As a whole the Dutch did not form a homogeneous group in Australia and they were not a distinct speech community. This was largely due to their individualistic pursuit of economic improvement and their dispersed settlement in Australia. Zubrzycki has described the Dutch in such terms in his study of settlers in the Latrobe Valley: 'The Dutch population in Moe is simply a collection of individuals of common ethnic origin who happen to live within the boundaries of a local government unit.' (1964:181-182). An exception should be made for Dutch settlers from Limburg, they view their own Limburgs dialect as more important and of more value than Dutch, and they often have Limburgers as friends. In many places in Australia they have active Carnavals Clubs. The club in Canberra, which is part of the Canberra-Dutch Club, has organised trips to Holland at 'carnavals' (=carnival) time for its members. Zubrzycki (1964) and Unikoski (1978) have also pointed out in their studies differences between the Limburgers and other Dutch.

Of my thirty informants eleven came to Australia in the forties/fifties (40s/50s), thirteen came in the sixties (60s), the other six came in the seventies/eighties (70s/80s). Many of the differences between the 40s/50s and the 60s groups run parallel with the differences in terms of educational background. This is not surprising since those belonging to the 60s group were generally well educated when they came to Australia. One difference between the groups related to satisfaction with various aspects of life in Australia, with the 40s/50s group being more satisfied than the 60s group with work prospects, children's education and future, quality of life and their close friends. This could also have been due to the greater commitment of the earlier
group to a permanent settlement in Australia. Educational background had no influence on the satisfaction variables.

Few people in the 60s group knew no English prior to arrival in Australia (5% as against 24% in the earlier group). In general the 60s group feels more Dutch (30% did not want to be naturalised as against 7% of the earlier group), speaks more Dutch at home, claims to be more indifferent about being Dutch, is not embarrassed about speaking or being spoken to in Dutch in public, and is more concerned about not having very many close friends in Australia. They have a better command of both languages in both active and passive language skills, and except for letter writing and television watching they also have more contact with Dutch through the various media. These results indicate that length of residence was not the most important cause of these inter-group differences. The correlation coefficients in Table 7.1 support the distinction made between Dutch migrants arriving in the forties and fifties and those who arrived in the sixties for a number of variables.

### TABLE 7.1
Comparison of a number of variables for Dutch migrants arriving in Australia in different periods (correlation coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>period of arrival</th>
<th>period of arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fluency</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowing English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prior to arrival -.46 .30
feeling mostly .18
Dutch or Australian -.19 .18
educational qualif. -.57 .46

Table 7.2 shows (as one might expect) that in general respondents who have lived in Australia the longest spoke the least Dutch within the family domain, although several of them (32% of those who at the time of the survey did not speak Dutch) said they would like to speak Dutch.

(Table 7.2 about here)

In Table 7.3 the respondents are divided in three groups according to the period in which they arrived: the 40s/50s, the 60s, and the 70s/80s. It is the 60s group which, according to their self-report, uses English the least in praying, dreaming, counting, and expressing anger. The 70s/80s group has the lowest percentage for English usage in thinking, while the 40s/50s group has the lowest percentage for Dutch usage in spelling.

(Table 7.3 about here)

No general pattern occurred for the use of both languages in these six processes or activities. More people used both languages when expressing anger than in any other activity.

Club membership is generally very infrequent among Dutch immigrants, with
Table 7.2

Whether English, or Dutch, or both are spoken within the family by length of residence in Australia (in years) (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of residence</th>
<th>20 or less</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31 or more</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-locutors</td>
<td>language(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with spouse</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total N</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with childr. now</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total N</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with children</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total N</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between themselves</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total N</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1986 ACT data
Table 7.3

Period of arrival in Australia by language(s) used to pray, dream, think, count, spell, and express anger (percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of arrival</th>
<th>70s/80s</th>
<th>60s</th>
<th>40s/50s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both languages</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both languages</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both languages</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both languages</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both languages</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both languages</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N = 93

Source: 1986 ACT data
only 5% of my respondents belonging to a Dutch club. Unikoski observed in her study of Polish, Dutch and Maltese communities in Victoria 'the absence of strong ethnic consciousness among the Dutch settlers' (1978:169) and pointed out that only 10 to 15% belong to a Dutch club. She continues: 'a rapid influx of considerable numbers of Dutch settlers ..... was not accompanied by the proliferation of communal organisations seen in various other ethnic groups. On the contrary, the formation of Dutch organisations was a slow, somewhat casual process, often depending on incidental causes or individual stimulus.' (1978:171). Regardless whether clubs were Dutch or Australian, the group of later arrivals in my sample had an even lower club membership rate than the earlier arrivals.

7.4 SUMMARY

Analysis of educational background, length of residence and period of arrival indicated that these variables do not completely run parallel, but that some differences existed with respect to many assimilation issues, variables indicating national pride and identification, and active use of, contact with, and command of Dutch. Those who arrived in the sixties are more fluent in Dutch than those who arrived in the fifties. They are, however, particularly close in relation to the observed transference phenomena. Transference of discourse markers was widespread, with only informants who tried hard to speak correct Dutch making less use of this type of marker. The earlier group, those who arrived in the forties and fifties, made more use of semantic transfers, and it was in the speech of those few informants who spoke with great care, who tried to avoid using lexical transfers, that these semantic transfers occurred most often. Clyne has pointed out (1967:112) that this could
well be an instance of hypercorrection, and my findings seem to support his observation.

Syntactic transference occurred slightly more in the speech of the earlier group. They seemed, for example, to use English word order more often. Both groups used many lexical transferences, with the earlier group integrating these transfers more often.

Phonological transference was more typical of the speech of the earlier group, while prosodic transference, though very rare, occurred only in the speech of a few later arrivals. Three of those informants whose speech was marked by phonological transference also showed what Hasselmo called "morphologically ragged" switching (1970:182), that is, instances of imperfect code-switching. Much overlap between the two languages occurred and the informants switched between the two languages without any discipline. Because of the extent of homophony it was not always possible to determine which language the informant was, or thought he/she was, speaking.

In section 2.1.2.2 I mentioned several researchers who had concluded that in general women seem to maintain their native language at a slightly higher rate than men, this study is no exception in that I found women to be more fluent, that is they scored higher on the fluency-scale, than the men in this study. Half my informants were women. Compared with my male informants they fell in the same agegroups, slightly more had twelve years of education (but more men had attained higher educational qualifications), and they had the same feelings of national pride and identification. There is very little difference between men and women with regard to these factors, still the women have maintained their native language better.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS

Dutch as it is spoken now by Dutch immigrants living in the ACT is very much the product of the attitudes and the degree of knowledge of both English and Dutch of each individual speaker. All reference made here to Dutch speech is to speech as it was observed in an interview situation, always involving the same bilingual interviewer, while much of the retrospective data was based on respondents' self-report. Within the interview situation, which inevitably is always somewhat unnatural, two styles were observed. When talking together about everyday topics the style was more casual than the style which the informants used to describe the pictures they were shown. The interlocutors and the pictures were the stable factors in the speech event, while the influence of the discourse was a variable factor for part of the interview.

The speech of all informants showed obvious influences of contact with English. Borrowing, code-switching and various types of transference occurred. Code-switching, although generally held in low esteem by many informants, occurred in these interviews in a way which was not random. Occasionally was it used because the speaker struck a gap in his/her knowledge of Dutch, but mostly it was caused by the context and usually was not even noticed by the speakers themselves. Several of my informants did make the comment that they found it easier to understand speech if code-switching took place at the constituent boundaries, and most of the time that is where it occurred in their speech too. They did not use the term constituent boundaries, but described the
different speech varieties, and what it was they found easy or difficult to understand. In general they were more concerned with getting the message across, with communicating an idea, than they were with which language they were actually using. The speakers would even deny they had switched codes if it was pointed out to them. It was often difficult to distinguish between the use of elements transferred from English to Dutch and actual language shift. Many speakers continued to use 'ja' in stead of 'yes' or 'yeah', and to a lesser extent 'nee' in stead of 'no'. Perhaps the purpose of this was to project a certain ethnic identity, but why 'ja' was used more than 'nee' was not clear. In general, however, there was much less opportunity to use 'nee', since that would mostly happen as a negative answer to a question, while 'ja' was not only used for expressing agreement, but also as pause filler and to keep the conversation going, reassuring the speaker that she was still being heeded.

Speakers with equal levels of linguistic command did not necessarily exhibit equal amounts of language shift. They differed considerably in the amount of transference in their speech. Apart from educational background and date of arrival in Australia, other important individual parameters were attitude to the mother country and to other Dutch people, and reasons for leaving the Netherlands.

A Dutch speech community using a particular variety of Dutch does not exist in Australia, nor does one Australian Dutch speech variety exist. Most of the respondents spoke a regional variety of Dutch and standard Dutch, or a lower class variety. Of all varieties of Dutch speech Limburgs has been maintained the most. Limburgers would often speak Limburgs in the company of immigrants of other parts of the Netherlands, and so exclude them from their conversation.
Unfortunately in this study the number of immigrants from Limburg was too small to compare quantitative and qualitative transference in their speech with that of other Dutch people. Language loyalty tended to become obvious when informants spoke about the particular variety of Dutch spoken in that part of the Netherlands from which they themselves came, rather than in relation to standard Dutch.

For a few Dutch immigrants Dutch was still the dominant language, especially in the affective domain, or when they felt the need for secrecy or for other types of anti-social behaviour. For the majority, however, English had become the dominant language. Dominance of Dutch caused lexical transfers to be more integrated, and more semantic transference to occur, but no prosodic transference occurred. Those fluent in both languages switched easily from one language to the other depending on domain, topic, interlocutor or setting. Their speech showed least phonological, semantic and syntactic transference. The occurrence of transference depended of course largely on whether the interlocutor was bilingual in the same two languages as the speaker, since the most important factor in a conversation is the ability to communicate. Interviews interrupted by telephone conversations and visits from monolingual (English-speaking) neighbours, relatives or friends demonstrated this clearly. Lexical transference and transfer of discourse markers occurred frequently. Lexical transference was often the result of a new lifestyle in a new environment, demanding adjustment to new customs. For this reason most of these transfers had to do with life in Australia, usually work, leisure or shopping. Transference should really be seen as a utilitarian speech variety, an intermediate stage between the eroding native language and the growing dominance of the language of the host society in most functions, without
attaching more importance to it than one would to a passing phenomenon.

All respondents had a relaxed view about their children not being able to speak Dutch. Some regretted it more than others, but a sense of pragmatic resignation seemed general. Having left the Netherlands, and having now lived for a considerable time in Australia, it is inevitable that Dutch immigrants will have experienced loss of some ethnic and cultural characteristics and that what has not been lost will have been influenced by residence in Australia. But this tendency has been strengthened by their casual attitude towards their Dutch heritage. The Dutch have not formed an identifiable social group. They have never felt ethnic identity important enough to organise Dutch festivities and traditions on a large scale. They came as individuals to Australia and often consciously avoided other Dutch people. Their invisibility relates not only to physical appearance, culture and language, but also to educational background, occupational mobility, and business, political and artistic participation.

Before I started this study I was curious to find out, if it was true that the Dutch were not concerned about their language and about passing it on to the next generation, and what, if anything, it was they actually did pass on. Most parents felt that it was important to preserve some of their Dutch heritage. 'Gezelligheid' (=cosiness, homeliness) seems to be the most important cultural value passed on to the next generation. Family-centered social occasions for which 'een gezellig huis' (=a cosy home) provides the setting is an intrinsic part of 'being Dutch'. 'Gezelligheid' for most informants very much seemed to go hand in hand with a certain type of furnishing and interior decorating such as: having small objects around the house, a nameplate on the frontdoor, lots of indoor plants, floor-lamps, wall-lamps and clocks. All this expressed a great
interest in making the house as 'gezellig' as possible. Another aspect of being Dutch is liking particular kinds of Dutch food. Nearly all informants who had children mentioned that they often ate certain Dutch specialties with their children, and that the children often maintained these dishes and special foods.

As their children moved away from home, many parents found they had less need to assimilate, to speak English, and they started to use Dutch again more often. Yet language, it seemed, was not important for the survival of a Dutch identity. The Dutch do not regard it as a symbol of ethnic identity. The fact that they no longer spoke Dutch, and had integrated very well into Australian society, did not mean these Dutch immigrants no longer saw themselves having a Dutch identity, or at least as having feelings of affection and respect for their mother country. Since they had not formed closely-knit communities, but had mainly migrated and settled as individual families, language maintenance had not been supported by influxes of new immigrants. An important stimulus to language maintenance for the Dutch informants in this study was a possible visit to the Netherlands at some time in the near future. Most informants were aware of the fact that their Dutch was somewhat dated and would need brushing up, since English words often came to mind first. Another important factor contributing to the maintenance of Dutch was the presence of relatives, especially parents (often one parent) who after retirement in the Netherlands would join a son or daughter in Australia.

Words designating Dutch culture-specific concepts, products and features may remain part of the vocabulary much longer than other words. This certainly seemed to be the case, for example, with kassen (glasshouses), woonboten (houseboats), gezelligheid (cosiness), stroopwafel (treacle-wafer), dijk
(dyke) and in greetings and leave-taking expressions. The Dutch first
generation immigrants in this study were more acculturated in language than in
food or interior decorating. However, as indicated in Chapter 4, in a few areas
such as counting and expressing anger, some resistance to the use of English
was observed. While on the whole the women were better in maintaining their
native language than men.

Those Dutch bilinguals concerned about accurate use of Dutch are, in the
absence of substantial groups of new immigrants arriving in Australia, likely
to be the only ones who will continue to speak the language. Their Dutch will
continue to resemble Dutch as it was spoken in the area from which they came
and by the social class to which they belonged at the time of their departure
from the Netherlands. Language-conscious people keep use of transfers to a
minimum and make an effort to speak standard Dutch. But the next generation,
born in Australia, will have hardly any active knowledge of the Dutch language
and the shift from Dutch to English will be virtually complete in one
generation.
APPENDIX A

Most of the questions can be answered by putting down a number. Here is an example:

Do you speak Dutch at home now?

Yes ___ No ___

Sometimes I will ask you to write in an answer. In that case simply write it in the space above the question.

Please do read all the questions carefully before answering.

Thank you very much for participating.

However, if I have wrongly included you in my sample, please tick this box and return this questionnaire to me. Using the stamped and addressed envelope.

Marijke van Ommeren

15 December 1985

QUESTIONNAIRE

LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AMONG THE DUTCH

IN CANBERRA
HOW TO FILL IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Most of the questions can be answered by only circling a number. Here is an example:

Do you speak Dutch at home now?

yes, most of the time 1
yes, every now and again 2
no 3
live alone 4

If you do speak Dutch at home most of the time now, circle 1

Sometimes I will ask you to write in an answer - in that case simply write it in the space following the question.

Please do read all the questions carefully.

Enjoy the questionnaire!

Thank you very much for helping me!

However if I have wrongly included you in my sample, please tick this box and return this questionnaire to me, using the stamped and addressed envelope.

[ ] I am not born in the Netherlands, nor is my spouse, nor is one of my parents.
1. What year did you first arrive in Australia?

2. How long have you lived in other English speaking countries?

3. Did you know any English prior to your arrival?
   - yes, very well
   - yes, some
   - no, none at all

4. When were you born?

5. Where were you born?
   - Town
   - State / Province
   - Country

6. And, if you have a spouse, where was he or she born?
   - Town
   - State / Province
   - Country

7. Have you been naturalised?
   - Yes
   - No, but am thinking about it
   - No, do not want to

8. What was the main reason for your coming to Australia?
   - Economic, wanted to get a better job
   - Had family here
   - Just thought life might be better here
   - other (please name)

9. What was your last job or occupation before coming to Australia?
   Please describe clearly, do not put e.g. "public servant".
10. What is your job or occupation now?

11. Have your parents migrated to Australia?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Father, yes</th>
<th>Mother, yes</th>
<th>Both, yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What language did your parents speak to each other when you were respectively 5 and 16 years old, and now? (Please answer A, B and C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>A) 5 years old</th>
<th>B) 16 years old</th>
<th>C) Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly Dutch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half/half</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only one parent present</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no parents present</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only Dutch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What language did you speak to your Father, when you were respectively 5 and 16 years old, and now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>A) 5 years old</th>
<th>B) 16 years old</th>
<th>C) Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly Dutch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half/half</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father not present</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only Dutch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What language did you speak to your Mother, when you were 5 and 16 years old, and now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>A) 5 years old</th>
<th>B) 16 years old</th>
<th>C) Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly Dutch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half/half</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother not present</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only Dutch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What language did you speak with your brother(s) and sister(s) when you were 5 and 16 years old, and now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>A) 5 years old</th>
<th>B) 16 years old</th>
<th>C) Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly Dutch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half/half</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no siblings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only Dutch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. What language did you speak with your friends when you were 5 and 16 years old, and now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>A) 5 years old</th>
<th>B) 16 years old</th>
<th>C) Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mostly English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly Dutch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half/half</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only Dutch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Are any of your present friends Dutch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes, most of them</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half/half</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes, some</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How good is your command of English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>understand</th>
<th>read</th>
<th>speak</th>
<th>write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. How good is your command of Dutch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>understand</th>
<th>read</th>
<th>speak</th>
<th>write</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Do you now A) read in Dutch any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>books</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magazines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspapers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) write in Dutch any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) watch or listen to any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch films</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Do you speak Dutch at home now?

yes, most of the time 1
yes, some of the time 2
no 3
live alone 4

22. What language do you speak with your spouse now?

mostly English 1
mostly Dutch 2
half/half 3
have no spouse or partner 4
other 5
only English 6
only Dutch 7

23. If you have any children could you tell me their ages and sex please?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have no children go to question 30, skip questions 24 to 29.

24. What language do you speak with your children now?

mostly English 1
mostly Dutch 2
half/half 3
only English 4
only Dutch 5

25. What language does your spouse/partner speak to your children?

mostly English 1
mostly Dutch 2
half/half 3
have no spouse/partner 4
only English 5
26. What language do your children speak to each other?

- mostly English
- mostly Dutch
- half/half
- one child only
- only English

27. Would you like your children to speak Dutch?

- yes
- indifferent
- no, not really

28. Do any of your children attend a school where a foreign language is used, either all the time, or only part-time (e.g., Saturday school, special classes)? Or did they?

- yes, regular school
- yes, special classes
- no

29. Do you worry about your children's English (e.g., do you try to improve their English)?

- yes, certainly
- yes, somewhat
- indifferent
- no

30. Is it an advantage to be able to speak Dutch?

- yes
- no
- do not know

31. This is a hard question, but maybe you have some idea! Could you say whether you pray, dream, think, count, spell or express anger in Dutch or in English or in both?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pray</th>
<th>dream</th>
<th>think</th>
<th>count</th>
<th>spell</th>
<th>express anger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in Dutch mostly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in English mostly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in both languages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can not say</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in English only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Dutch only</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Which language do you find more expressive?

- Dutch
- English
- equal
- can not say
33. Is it necessary to speak Dutch in order to "be Dutch"?

- yes: 1
- no: 2

34. Do you consider yourself to be Dutch or Australian?

- Dutch, completely: 1
- Australian, completely: 2
- mixed: 3
- do not know: 4
- mostly Dutch: 5
- mostly Australian: 6

35. Are you proud to be of Dutch origin?

- yes: 1
- no: 2
- indifferent: 3

36. Do you plan to live in Australia for the rest of your life?

- yes, definitely: 1
- yes, would like to but it depends on other factors: 2
- I am not sure: 3
- no, probably not: 4
- no, definitely not: 5

37. How satisfied are you with life in Australia with regard to the following issues, below A) to E), ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Very very satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) your work and its prospects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) your children's education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) your children's future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) quality of life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) having close friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. What do you think is in general the attitude of Australians to Dutch people?

- very friendly: 1
- friendly: 2
- indifferent: 3
- unfriendly: 4
- very unfriendly: 5
39. Do you feel embarrassed when you speak Dutch or are spoken to in Dutch in public?

- yes sure 1
- yes, a little 2
- no not really 3
- not at all 4

40. Have you ever experienced any discrimination?

- yes 1
- somewhat 2
- no 3

41. Are you likely to visit Holland in the near future?

- yes 1
- no 2

42. Have your grandparents, or one of them, visited you here?

- yes 1
- no 2
- have no grandparents 3

43. Do your grandparents speak Dutch or English to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no grandparents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Do your parents speak Dutch or English to your children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have no parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have no children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. What is the highest grade of primary or secondary school completed by you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Primary Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


46. Since leaving school have you obtained a trade qualification, degree or diploma or any other qualifications?

   yes          1
   no           2

   If no go to question 49 and skip 47 and 48.

47. Name of Qualifications

48. Name of Institution where you obtained this or these qualification(s).

49. What is your religious denomination?

   Catholic               1
   Church of England      2
   Methodist              3
   Orthodox               4
   Presbyterian           5
   Uniting Church         6
   no particular church   7
   no religion            8
   other (please specify) 

50. Are you an active member of the church community?

   yes          1
   rather       2
   no           3

51. Are you a member of a community club or an organisation (eg. sport, drama, dancing, music etc..)?

   Dutch club or organisation(s) 1
   Australian club(s) or organisation(s) 2
   Australian and Dutch club(s) or organisation(s) 3
   no member of any clubs or organisations 4

52. Could you tell me what your total income was in the last twelve months?

53. Are you the only breadwinner in your household?

   yes          1
   no           2
54. Do you ever wonder how you will make ends meet when you think about the costs of living for your household?

often 1
sometimes 2
hardly ever 3
never 4

55. Now please look back to Question 8 (main reason for coming to Australia). Do you feel your reason(s) for coming here have been justified?

yes, definitely 1
yes, more or less 2
not quite 3
no 4
not at all 5

Would you like to receive a copy of my report, telling you about the results of this study?

yes 1
no 2

Would you be willing to let me talk briefly to you (and your Family) ?

yes 1
no 2

Thank you very very much for helping me!

Please return this questionnaire as soon as possible!
APPENDIX B

PICTURES SHOWN TO INFORMANTS
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, A.B.

Australian Bureau of Statistics
1950-1986 Yearbook. Canberra, AGPS.
1985 Overseas Arrivals and Departures. Cat.No.3404.0, Canberra, AGPS.

Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs

Baetens Beardsmore, H.

Bettoni, C.
1981 Italian in North Queensland. Townsville, James Cook University.

Beyer, G.
1964 'Two Recent Publications on Migration from the Netherlands', International Migration II, 3: 212-216.

Bloomfield, L.

Clyne, M.G.
1977a 'Bilingualism of the Elderly', *Talanya* 4: 45-56.


1979 'Factors Promoting Migrant Language Maintenance in Australia', in P. de Lacey and M. E. Poole (eds.), *Mosaic or Melting Pot*. Sydney: 119-128.


Conklin, N.F. and M.A.Lourie


Corder, S.P.


Denison, N.


Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs

1984 *Profile '81: 1981 Census Data on the Australian Population*. Canberra, AGPS.

Di Pietro, R.J.


Dorian, N.


Dressler, W. and R. Wodak-Leodolter

Elich, J.H.
1985 'De Omgekeerde Wereld', Dutch-Australian Weekly 34,3.

Fishman, J.A.

Gardner, R.C. and W.E. Lambert


Gumperz, J.J.

Gumperz, J.J. and E. Hernández-Chavez

Harvey, S.D.

Hasselmo, N.

Haugen, E.


Hidalgo, M.

Hockett, C.E.

Johnston, R.


Kloss, H.
Lambert, W.E.

Lenneberg, E.H.

McAllister, I.

Mackey, W.F.

Martin, J.I.

Nijenhuis, J.G.J.

Overberg, H.

Pauwels, A.F.
Peñalosa, F.

Price, C.A.

Price, C.A and P.Pyne

Rabel-Heyman, L.

Reinsma, R.
1975 *Signalement van Nieuwe Woorden*. Amsterdam/Brussel.

Reyes, R.

Ross, J.A.

Shaffer, D.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T.
1975 'Bilingualism, Semilingualism and School Achievement', *AILA World Congress, Abstracts*.
Smolicz, J.J.
1979 *Culture and Education in a Plural Society*. Canberra.

Smolicz, J.J. and R. Wiseman

Swadesh, M.

Taft, R.

Trudgill, P. and G.A. Tzavaras

Unikoski, R.

Weinreich, U.

Zubrzycki, J.
1964 *Settlers of the Latrobe Valley*. Canberra, ANU Press.