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The relationship of Dutch children's score on the Active Usage Scale to other variables.
The large-scale migration of non-English speaking peoples to Australia since the Second World War has led, for the first time in the country's history, to widespread, diverse multilingualism. Half a million young people in Australia were raised speaking languages other than English, but have had English as their language of school instruction. Thus, they are at least nominally bilingual. Little is known either about the fate of their mother tongue, however, or of the attitudes of such youngsters to their own bilingualism. The acquisition of English is officially encouraged, with at least some attention being paid to those with difficulties. The retention or cultivation of migrant languages has not been explicitly discouraged, (although English has been the compulsory language of school instruction since before Federation,) but little has so far been done officially to preserve the cultural wealth represented by these numerous native speakers of non-English languages.

This situation resembles that which obtained earlier in this century in the U.S.A. The Second World War demonstrated the language provincialism of the U.S.A., particularly the lack of language skills even amongst people who had been fluent in a non-English language when young. After the war the U.S. Government encouraged language maintenance amongst non-English
speaking groups, and this policy led to the launching in 1956 of a large scale 'Language Resources Project'\(^1\) a survey of the actual language maintenance situation among various major groups across the nation.

**American Studies**

Until the Project, most studies of migrant language behaviour in the U.S.A. were of three kinds: strictly linguistic studies investigating linguistic change when two languages met; pedagogic studies aimed at establishing whether or not bilingualism was a disadvantage to school children; sociological studies in which language behaviour was seen as a by-product of assimilation and language maintenance as a source of culture conflict. The numerous American pedagogic and linguistic studies are listed in Haugen's Bibliography\(^2\).

---

\(^1\)Some studies undertaken as part of the Project are published in Fishman 1966.

\(^2\)The aims and findings of the American pedagogic studies appear to reflect the prevailing contemporary attitudes to migrants. The earlier studies deplore mother tongue retention and find that it hinders children's assimilation and educational progress. These studies reflect the anxiety that if migrants do not conform to the Anglo-American ideal, American society would be fragmented. After the severe restrictions on immigration took effect, educators relaxed, cultural pluralism became permissible and studies found children unharmed by their two languages.
For this thesis the only specifically relevant pedagogic study is that of Hoffman, a New York school teacher, who surveyed children of mixed ethnic background in several schools. He devised an index which could be used to measure 'bilingual background'. The children's rating on this was then compared with their skills, intelligence, personality and social adjustment. He found no harmful effects from the children's bilingualism, findings endorsed by most modern psychologists. What were previously seen as handicaps due to bilingualism are now considered due to low socio-economic status, depressed living conditions and inadequate schools.

Linguistic studies of language-contact situations are usually highly specialised, and have a tantalizing lack of reference to the people whose speech is being studied. Those linguists particularly interested in the sociological aspects of multi-lingualism are referred to later in the next section.

Language is a central area of culture and the acquisition of the host society's language is perhaps the most basic task for any acculturating individual or group. In Hertzler's phrase 'Language is the facilitator of all other conditions of assimilation'.

1 Hoffman 1934
2 Hertzler 1965
In the U.S.A. a corollary of assimilation and fluency in English has frequently been the disappearance of the ancestral language; sometimes in one generation, more commonly over three generations. Such unstable bilingualism is found wherever diverse language groups migrate to a society with a vigorous core culture and language of its own. Examples of such societies which have received large numbers of migrants since the War are Israel, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, some South American countries and to a lesser extent the U.S.A. The rate of language shift in the migrant group depends partly on the characteristics of the group itself, partly on the receiving society. Eisenstadt found that the acquisition of Hebrew was strongest amongst groups with a high degree of pre-migration adjustment, lowest amongst poorly adjusted insecure groups. If the social distance between the host society and the migrants is not large, language learning will be enhanced by the acceptance of such migrants into the wider society. However, there are other possible, and widespread outcomes to situations of 'language contact'. If the newcomers are conquerors their language may become dominant and the indigenous population must become bilingual. In Latin America, Spanish or Portuguese are the accepted national languages of many citizens.

Eisenstadt 1954
whose ancestral language was Indian. But in Paraguay Guarani, an Indian language, has retained an official place as an equal with Spanish. Sometimes 'conquering' languages are creolised, or are used as a lingua franca. In some countries English or Russian are widely used for the study of science of technology; as second languages they are used only in very specific situations. Many countries have a High version of their language used for administration or by priests and a Low dialect language used for more intimate homely situations (e.g. the difference between classical Arabic and the Arabic spoken in Egypt or Morocco, or between standard German and dialect versions of it).

Switzerland also offers a model of a stable multi-lingual society; it has four official languages, and a variety of dialects, patois and ancient tongues which have resisted extinction. Weinreich\(^1\), an American linguist studied the Swiss 'languages in contact', and was impressed by the importance of sociological factors in the usage and maintenance of various languages. Moreover, he appreciated the positive values of language maintenance and the traumatic possibilities for children of being made to feel that their mother tongue is in some ways 'inferior'. Another American linguist of the post Second World War period, Einar Haugen

\(^1\) Weinreich 1953
made a lifetime study of the Norwegian language in America. He showed the relations between the history of the Norwegian immigrant group in the New World and the shape and fate of their language. Both Haugen and Weinreich called for a positive attitude in the U.S.A. towards migrant language retention, and for wider investigation of factors which facilitated or were hostile to language maintenance.

Census studies have been widely undertaken in the U.S.A. and Canada, since questions about language of childhood or first language are commonly included in national censuses. Scholars have not been satisfied with the particular questions asked as the categories have apparently varied from one census to another. Liebersen has made extensive use of census material on language usage, and has suggested a standard form for census questions which would enable group comparisons to be made over time.

Kloss has considered the particular factors in the American experience which have affected language maintenance, and lists six, only one of which could be considered relevant to experience in Australia: this is the pre-migration experience of

1 Liebersen 1964
2 Lieberson 1965
3 In Fishman 1968
a migrant group with language maintenance efforts in their home country. Kloss lists religious-societal insulation as crucial; the building up of a self-sufficient world-rejecting community which retains the ancestral language to exclude worldly influences or dominant cultural trends. Kloss regards this as the only factor which can be completely effective alone in language maintenance. He gives four other factors relevant to American migration history: (i) migrant groups arriving before the dominant Anglo-Americans, e.g. Spanish, French; (ii) the language was once an official tongue, e.g. French, Spanish or Dutch; (iii) the existence of 'language islands, which are areas where four-fifths of the inhabitants speak a minority language such as exist in New Mexico (Spanish), Pennsylvania and the Dakotas (German), Wisconsin and Minnesota (Swedish and Norwegian); (iv) the possession of a national religion requiring parochial schools e.g. French Canadians receive their education in French at Catholic schools and Lutheran schools use German.

Kloss also lists other factors which he regards as being ambivalent in their effects on language maintenance. These are high or low educational level of migrants, large or small numbers of migrant group; cultural and linguistic similarity or dissimilarity.

---

1 In Australia a somewhat similar example would be the Lutherans of the Barossa Valley, although they never completely rejected all the society around them.
to Anglo-Americans; suppression or permissiveness towards use of minority tongue and lastly the socio-cultural characteristics of the minority group. All these may or may not influence a particular group in its language behaviour, but they are really in the nature of intervening variables. The different effects upon language retention, for example of linguistic and cultural similarity, can be explained in terms of group motivation. Given the motive of maintenance it can be found that similarities conduce to acceptance by the host society, and minority group members maintain positive self concepts which transfer to language maintenance. Given a motivation towards language change the similarities of the two groups lead to the erosion of group consciousness and differences among the second and subsequent generations of the minority group.

More recent American studies have been made by Fishman among Puerto Rican Americans, and by Mackey in Canada who has developed a framework within which the complex psychological linguistic and social interrelationships of bilingualism can be quantified.

1 Fishman 1968b
2 In Fishman 1968a
There has been extensive investigation by psychologists of the mental processes of bilinguals. Ervin and Osgood developed a semantic differential which has been influential in the study of the psychological mechanisms involved in the possession of two languages, and particularly in the difficulties of continuous translation from one language to another. Samora has suggested that language choice can be an index of acculturation; this suggestion was amplification, as Samora was specifically concerned only with the relative acculturation and language shift among Colorado Indians.

Recently a large-scale study of Puerto Ricans in New York and New Jersey was undertaken by Fishman and his colleagues. There is a detailed investigation both of the sociological context of the group and an exhaustive census of their day-to-day language choice (Spanish or English), and their attitudes towards language and cultural maintenance.

Two British researchers have made recent contributions in the field. Halliday develops the concept of 'register' as an important factor in language choice; this is the term for the distinction we recognise between the appropriate speech (grammar, lexicon...).
lexicon and syntax) for a clergyman delivering a sermon and
that appropriate for a sports commentator describing a football
match. In situations where language communities are in contact
and there is a stable multi-lingualism, change of register may
well be an actual change in language.\footnote{Halliday observes that there are millions of people in the
world today speaking in English as their second language who
could discuss medicine or space travel in it (and only in
English), but be unable to use it for making love or doing
the washing up.}

Bernstein\footnote{In Fishman 1968a} studied the social origins of different
orders of perception expressed in the different 'languages'
used by middle and working class children. The former learn
the kind of language which enables them to systematise and order
their concepts, and to perceive long term effects and goals.
Working class children do not learn this language and are
handicapped in a classroom situation. This study has far
reaching implications for all who are concerned with the quality
and equality of education available to school children.

\begin{footnotes}
\item Halliday observes that there are millions of people in the
world today speaking in English as their second language who
could discuss medicine or space travel in it (and only in
English), but be unable to use it for making love or doing
the washing up.
\item Bernstein studied the social origins of different
orders of perception expressed in the different 'languages'
used by middle and working class children. The former learn
the kind of language which enables them to systematise and order
their concepts, and to perceive long term effects and goals.
Working class children do not learn this language and are
handicapped in a classroom situation. This study has far
reaching implications for all who are concerned with the quality
and equality of education available to school children.
\item Fishman 1968a
\item Clyne 1964
\item Zubrzycki 1968
\item Price 1945
\item Gilson & Zubrzycki 1967
\end{footnotes}
There have not yet been any language studies of methodological sophistication and wide scope in Australia. Clyne, a linguist, has studied children bilingual in German and English, with particular attention to the sociological factors involved in language maintenance. Clyne points to the need for Australia to recognise and conserve its resources of foreign language speakers, but this attitude is not yet widespread. Babel, the journal of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Association, reflects a narrower concern with education alongside, either of the religious behaviour of Dutch children in a 'foreign' language or of English as a foreign language to migrant children. State Education and Welfare Departments have material as yet unpublished on research amongst migrant children, and there are some theses by students for higher degrees in education listed in Zubrzycki.

Scholarly studies of migrant groups in Australia have mainly treated language behaviour in the context of migrant acculturation. Price has described the historical importance of the ethnic schools and press to language maintenance amongst the Germans in South Australia. Gilson and Zubrzycki have also written of the foreign language press in Australia, and Zubrzycki

1 Clyne 1964
2 Zubrzycki 1968
3 Price 1945
4 Gilson & Zubrzycki 1967
has studied migrant groups in the Latrobe Valley and described the importance of language maintenance to group cohesion.

Johnston\(^1\) has made a series of studies of the assimilation of Polish migrants in Western Australia. She finds that language retention can be a source of tension between parents and children, since the parents value Polish language maintenance highly while many children do not. Martin\(^2\) found that teaching their national language to their children was thought important by the majority of the 'refugee settlers' whom she studied. Mol's\(^3\) study of the religious behaviour of Dutch migrants in New Zealand found that most Dutch migrants spoke English at work, but still used Dutch at home; however, the longer they were in New Zealand the more likely they were to speak English in their spare time.

Studies of other national groups in Australia have also yielded information on attitudes to language maintenance. Mapstone\(^4\) found that among the Macedonians he studied in Victoria there was a strong desire for children and grandchildren to continue speaking Macedonian, for explicitly social rather than nationalistic reasons.

\(^{1}\)Johnston 1965, 1968, also Taft 1965.

\(^{2}\)Martin 1965

\(^{3}\)Mol 1965

\(^{4}\)Mapstone 1966
Since the older people and the women spoke little English the retention of Macedonian was important for family communication.

A different aspect of language and assimilation is demonstrated in some Western Australian studies described by Taft\(^1\). Richardson devised a Slang Test to discover respondents' acquaintance with Australian expressions; he then used this as an index of acculturation. This test has been used with British and Dutch adult migrants and with non-British born immigrant children. Taft finds that the Western Australian studies contradict the popular belief that a knowledge of English is a prerequisite for satisfaction and identification with Australia among non-British migrants. Rather, satisfaction with Australia subsequently leads to progress with English, (a finding borne out in American studies by Lambert\(^2\) and Lemaire\(^3\), who both state that language learning is facilitated by positive feelings in the student towards the national group whose language he is studying).

There are studies of other national groups in Australia, e.g. Italians and Germans by Borrie\(^4\), Italians in Western Australia

---

\(^1\) Taft 1965

\(^2\) In Fishman 1968\(^a\)

\(^3\) In Fishman 1966

\(^4\) Borrie 1954
(Gamba) and Victoria (Phillips). These studies all describe the importance of mother tongue retention for social cohesion and family communication amongst the migrants.

In 1968 Zubrzycki pleaded for more awareness from the Australian community of problems associated with the mother tongue of migrants and their children; difficulties with English can lead to social and vocational frustration: the shift from their mother tongue to English by children can lead to a breakdown in family communications, with all the attendant social problems. In particular notes the lack of relevant information taught at school, about the countries from which migrants come to Australia, and the lack of promotion of migrant languages.

Both community and academic awareness of the problems of language shift and maintenance can only be increased by further studies in the field. Since census information is not available, only small group studies can be undertaken. This thesis, although of limited scope and duration, is one such study.

---

1 Private communication.
This thesis examines part of the mosaic of language use and language maintenance of two groups of migrant children in Australia. A survey was carried out in Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, and Queanbeyan, New South Wales from July to October, 1968.

Studies of language maintenance have commonly been made in areas, rural and urban, with long established migrant groups, whose language retention or loss can be measured over a period of decades. The respondents in such surveys are usually adult children of first generation migrants, or even their children; information about their language patterns earlier in their life is not usually available.

Sociological studies of ongoing assimilation processes have contained reference to language behaviour, particularly in view of the economic importance of learning the language of the host community. However most of the emphasis in these studies has been on language shift; studies of language maintenance have been, until recently, made by linguists, with little reference to sociological considerations.

It is self evident that language depends upon social situation, both for its learning and practice, and that where different languages are known, the choice of any particular one, for use at any particular time, is also subject to the social situation. So far as this study is concerned, language use is
regarded as a dependent variable and particular factors have been singled out which, it is expected, will have explanatory relation to the pattern of language use.

A survey was carried out in Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, and Queanbeyan, New South Wales from July to October, 1968. In Canberra there are no long-established bilingual communities\(^1\). Therefore, a study of national language maintenance must be made amongst families who have migrated quite recently to Australia, as part of the large-scale migration programmes begun after the Second World War. The Australian community was of predominantly British origin until these programmes began, so that on the whole, the only groups in Australia having a language other than English which they could maintain, are European migrants.

There are migrants from many countries in Canberra, and most European national groups are well represented. Two groups, Polish and Dutch, were chosen as providing the probability of a number of points of contrast. It was necessary that the children should themselves have been in Australia long enough to be entirely fluent in English; five years was taken to be a reasonable time for this. The children also had to be old enough to be able to think

\(^1\) Such communities have existed in the past in Australia and some may still do so. See C.A. Price 1945.
about their own language use, and to be aware of the attitudes of
families and themselves to their non-English tongue. Twelve seemed
a suitable age, since the strains of adolescence have hardly then
appeared.

Since the author speaks no other language except English, the migrant
parents had to understand written English and be able to speak it
themselves. Dutch and Polish groups were chosen as being likely
to understand and speak English tolerably well. The parents were
likely to have had at least elementary school educations. At the
same time the two groups offered a number of contrasts. The Dutch
are economic 'voluntary' migrants who came to Australia for economic
reasons 'to give their children a better future'. The Polish group
were largely migrants displaced from home by the war, who chose not
to return, but instead emigrated overseas. They could be described
as political, 'refugee' migrants although there is, of course, a
strong economic element. Some of the Poles who have migrated since
1957 should be described as more purely economic voluntary migrants.

As well as the contrast of Teuton and Slav, the Netherlands
and Poland also contrast in their historical attitudes to the
maintenance of their ethnic tongue.

The Netherlands has a variety of dialects, some of which
are nearly incomprehensible to speakers of others. There is also
a quite separate language, Frisian, spoken by many Dutch in Northern
Holland. Although standard Dutch is used and taught in the schools,
the importance of other languages of wider commercial use, such as English, French and German has long been stressed. The Dutch as a long time sea faring and trading nation are efficient linguists. Very few arrive in Australia with no previous acquaintance with English. In many ways their language is sufficiently like English to facilitate easy learning; indeed there can be few other migrant groups amongst whom one could find an adult husband and wife who, within ten years of coming to this country, speak only English to each other at all times.

The Polish situation is quite otherwise. Firstly Polish being a Slavonic language does not resemble English either grammatically or lexically. Secondly, the historical picture is different. During the past two centuries Poland has been frequently invaded, and for 150 years had no independent existence, being ruled in division by Germany, Austria and Russia. The resistance of the people to their foreign overlords was epitomised in their love of the Polish social clubs and the Dutch Extasen were helpful in identifying some members of the communities, and once the survey in the face of persecution, and the compulsory use of German or Russian in every sphere of life. Their patriots were frequently poets and writers, who held the language itself as a symbol of pride and of national identity. Hence there is a tradition of conscious language maintenance followed at every level of society.

Sample

The survey groups consisted of 50 Dutch and 37 Polish children. In the case of the Dutch children, these were all children of Dutch

performance of sixth grade children.
parentage in sixth grade at schools in the Canberra area. The Polish group consisted of all the sixth grade children of Polish parentage in Canberra schools (16) plus all the sixth grade Polish children in Queanbeyan schools (6). As this number seemed too small for adequate comparisons to be made, all fifth grade Polish children in Queanbeyan were included (6), plus ten fifth grade children at school in Canberra; these were fifth graders attending schools which had sixth grade Polish children attending.

The names of the children were acquired in various ways. In a survey of all sixth grade children in Canberra being undertaken early in 1968 by Keeves\(^1\), children were asked whether English was spoken at home. In some cases where the children replied in the negative they specified what language was spoken at home; hence children speaking Dutch or Polish could be selected. Where they did not specify the language it was sometimes possible to guess from surnames, although this was not a very reliable method. Officials of the Polish social clubs and the Dutch Embassy were helpful in identifying some members of the communities, and once the survey began the children interviewed sometimes knew of other children who had been missed. Although not every school in Canberra is represented, and there may have been some sixth graders overlooked, probably very few were not located by the end of the survey. However, the small number of Polish children in sixth grade was insufficient to make meaningful comparisons with the Dutch group. It was decided to augment the group using sixth

\(^1\) J. Keeves was engaged on research into aspects of the school performance of sixth grade children.
grade children of Polish parents in Queanbeyan and fifth grade children of Canberra and Queanbeyan. Queanbeyan, which had only four schools for primary school children, was easy to canvass, but in Canberra, since time was short, it was necessary to choose only those schools with sixth grade Polish children already attending. Hence a school with no Polish sixth grader, but having a fifth grader, was not visited, and the fifth grade child was not included in the survey.

Queanbeyan is a small, old established town just over the boundary from Australian Capital Territory in New South Wales. As it is only twelve miles away and offers cheap rents, many of its inhabitants work in Canberra, it is also a closely knit community with a strong sense of local identity. The Polish families who live in Queanbeyan probably have more contact with each other than is possible in Canberra, which is larger and geographically much more dispersed. In Canberra, for instance, a number of families were unable to send their children to Saturday School because of the travelling distance involved. It was realised that this geographical factor has sociological implications, e.g. a Polish family in Queanbeyan may find it easier to be in close touch with other Polish people and hence the use of Polish language may be reinforced. There are also marked socio-economic differences between Canberra and Queanbeyan, in that the range of occupations and occupational levels is much more restricted in Queanbeyan than Canberra. Differences in ethnic contact and language maintenance do appear between Canberra and Queanbeyan Polish children, but they
were not great enough to unbalance the sample\(^1\).

A survey of this kind has clear limitations from a strictly statistical inferential point of view; it is not possible to generalise from information gained in this survey about the situation of groups not directly included within it. Canberra is not very like any other Australian city, either geographically or demographically. The occupations of the fathers amongst the groups surveyed did not even match those found amongst other sixth graders' families in Canberra\(^2\); the occupation figures for Canberra are different from the rest of Australia. Also the groups surveyed cannot necessarily be considered representative of the Polish and Dutch communities in Canberra. Finally, very small numbers are involved. Ideally, a longer term study with controlled experimental groups would be more satisfactory, but particularly in Canberra it would always be very difficult to define the universe from which the sample was obtained, or to make wide inferences from such a sample.

**Method**

Despite this preparation, some questions failed in their object and some proved to be irrelevant. An example of the latter is the question asking the child whether he thought in his mother tongue. Many of the children seemed to have trouble maintaining the concept of thinking verbally, and denied that they thought in any language. One question which failed to obtain the information enquiring into the children's perception of attitudes to hearing their mother tongue spoken. Wording this differently so that the children could discuss what Australians

---

\(^1\)See Appendix V

\(^2\)See Table 3:9
A questionnaire provides a speedy method of obtaining a wide range of comparable data from families and enables the author to investigate situations not otherwise available to observation. If administered in person the additional benefits of some observations of the family situation are obtained. Administration to the children alone through the schools was considered at one time, but there were difficulties of access to Australian Capital Territory schools. In any case the advantages of home visits with the possibility of gaining a wider range of information about practice and attitudes seemed overriding.

The questionnaire was first tried out on three Canberra families, of respectively Latvian, German and Italian origin with sixth grade children; some alterations were then made and a second small pilot study was made with two Polish and two Dutch families with fourth grade children. Further minor alterations were then made to the wording of the questionnaire.

Despite this preparation, some questions failed in their object and some proved to be irrelevant. An example of the latter is the question asking the child whether he thought in his mother tongue. Many of the children seemed to be unable to understand the concept of thinking verbally, and denied that they thought in any language. One question which failed to obtain the information desired was that enquiring into the children's perception of Australian attitudes to hearing their mother tongue spoken. Wording this differently so that the children could discuss what Australians
thought when they heard other people talking Polish and Dutch, might have been more successful, but it is a very sensitive area. Although the author, as a native born Australian, hoped to appear linguistically and nationally neutral, this was not really possible. She clearly represented the host community to parents and children, and some were defensive and concerned as to the Australian view of their language behaviour.

In order to enlist the cooperation of all the families concerned the author visited each family in advance and made an appointment for an interview with parents and child. Since the child had to be home from school this meant a time was selected when the father was also home; with both parents nearby, even if not within earshot, the children clearly felt strongly bound to express their family’s attitudes, of which they were all well aware.

There were also occasions when parents were clearly able to hear children’s answers, although somewhat separated, particularly if there was any discussion. It was difficult to avoid such situations since physical separation was not always possible to arrange.

As the survey progressed, both parents and children became well aware of what was being asked from other children and parents already interviewed. Sometimes answers seemed almost rehearsed. These considerations make it necessary to regard the answers to
questions of attitude with caution. Experience with this survey suggests that a reliable comparison of attitudes to language maintenance between parents and children may not be obtained within the limits of a short interview situation.

Children and adults interviewed would undoubtedly respond differently to an interviewer able to speak their national language. If of similar ethnic origin such an interviewer would not face the problem of being identified with the host community. Moreover, the interviewer could assess the children's proficiency in the national language quite easily. However, identification into the migrant community can make for other problems. A migrant group with an ideology of old country language and cultural loyalty might feel threatened by the failures of the young to attain a proper standard of speech, or an individual family might feel obliged to express themselves as being less favourably inclined towards English than they usually felt.

Some of the difficulties were foreseen; others appeared as the survey progressed. None seemed so serious as to vitiate the results of the enquiry.

1 See Appendix I
2 See Footnote 2 on next page.
The Questionnaire

The questionnaire is in two parts. The first part was completed by the author using the answers given by the children. The second part was for parents to complete by themselves; this helped to ensure some privacy for author and child, though this was often less complete than could be wished.

The bulk of the children's questionnaire is devoted to an enquiry into actual language usage patterns within and without the home, by the child and his fellow ethnic contacts. This descriptive part of the survey was built up from the answers to questions 3 to 81, 11 to 18 and 24 to 29.

Patterns of language use are differentiated within six domains of usage; home, religion, formal ethnic organisations, with fellow ethnic peers, with fellow ethnic adults, and literature and correspondence.

The concept of domains of usage has been widely developed since its introduction before the Second World War by Schmidt-Rohr2. In multi-lingual communities there are relatively stable patterns of language choice in particular socio-culturally recognised spheres of activity; Schmidt-Rohr distinguished spheres where the choice

1 See Appendix I

2 See Footnote 1, next page.
of one language over another was characterised as a dominant configuration of some particular domain. Schmidt-Rohr suggested nine domains; the family, the church, literature, the press, the military, the courts and governmental administration. Subsequent researchers have either added or subtracted domains from their investigation, depending upon the socio-cultural setting of their subjects. 'Certainly, immigrant-host contexts, in which only the language of the host society is recognized for governmental functions, would require other and perhaps fewer domains, particularly if younger generations constantly leave the immigrant society and enter the host society.'

The domains used in this study seemed the appropriate ones for the description of the children in an immigrant-host society multi-lingual society; the dynamic situation is that usually encountered in modern immigration contexts. Minority groups such as immigrants must adopt the host society's language as well as its culture. This can be readily seen if fishman p. 1007 - There is a detailed description of the analysis of multi-lingual settings by Fishman ch. VII pp. 1000-1028 1968 upon which this summary is based, including a history of the concept of the domains of usage, and an extensive bibliography. Fishman considers the concept of domains of usage validated as analytic parameters for the study of socio-linguistic patterns by the major survey of the Puerto Rican community which he directed. Edelman (one of the project researchers) found that the responses to the census of language use, when subjected to factor analysis (verimax orthogonal rotation) yielded five factors which corresponded to the domains of education, work, family, religion and literacy.
context. Within such domains further differentiation is made between the children as speakers and hearers. This distinction is particularly important in the examination of home as a domain of usage. The family domain is a crucial one, since this is where the children learn their first language, and is also usually the last area where language maintenance can be encouraged if the mother tongue is being lost. In a dynamic multi-lingual situation\(^1\), such as exists in most places in Australia where immigrants have settled, the bilingualism of the second generation may rapidly become 'passive' i.e. the children can understand a conversation in their mother tongue, but can no longer construct a meaningful sentence in it, and use English to communicate. This can be readily seen if

\(^1\)A distinction is made by Weinreich between dynamic and stable multi-lingual societies; the dynamic situation is that usually encountered in modern immigration contexts. Minority groups enter as immigrants and adopt the host society's language as part of their acculturation and assimilation to that society. The first generation of immigrants learn the host language, but often retain at least a foreign accent; the second generation become bilingual as children, but increasingly use the host society's language throughout their lives, and the third generation have the host society's language as their mother tongue.
a distinction is made between the language they hear at home and the language they use at home. In the religious domain a similar distinction is made between prayer and liturgy; in the domain of literature between exposure to the written version of their mother tongue, and actual practice in reading it.

Further distinctions are made in the home domain between various members of the family as interlocutors, and some attempt is made to elicit topics which may be usually productive of mother tongue use for discussion. The limitations of time and scope of this study did not allow for sufficient enquiry on this point; the children were not used to analysing their language behaviour and were vague, except that all agreed on meal-times as a common time when mother tongue was used.

There are some questions in the parents' questionnaire relating to language usage on the part of the parents and also the parents' assessment of children's usage and proficiency.

Both questionnaires enquired into attitudes to ethnic language retention. Both questionnaires elicit socio-demographic factors expected to have an explanatory relation to the pattern of language maintenance or shift in the family.

The factors selected as likely to be relevant are mainly those which have been found important in recent American studies; of course, not all the American migrant situation is duplicated in Australia, and the post-war Australian context is very different
from that of pre-1920 immigration in America.

One of the most important factors likely to affect language maintenance is the pattern of settlement of migrants. Price has described three types of group settlement in Australia:

(i) Organised group settlement - exemplified by the settlement of East German Lutherans in the Barossa Valley during the nineteenth century. These settlers had the support of this church in their language maintenance, and until the end of the century were able to conduct their own parochial schools in German. Church support for a national language is a potent strength to language maintenance effort e.g. Greek by the Greek Orthodox Church, Ukrainian by the Greek Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches.

(ii) Chain migration - exemplified by the Italian settlement in the irrigation areas around Griffith, New South Wales. Chain migration may have a strong reinforcing effect. As more settlers from the original area arrive it becomes easier for them to recreate networks of primary group membership among those speaking the same dialect. The mother tongue

1 In Borrie 1959

2 See also Kloss, Fishman and Nahirny in Fishman 1966.
is a strong cohesive factor for the group.

(iii) Gravitation - which takes place when migrants, after their arrival, move to an area which they know contains a number of other fellow countrymen, because they wish to be near them. Lone migrants or families living in areas with no other fellow ethnics have fewer opportunities to speak their mother tongue. Only by gravitating to places where there are other ethnic mother tongue speakers are they able to get any support from the group, either through friendships or association with ethnic organisations.

Only the third category is relevant to the situation in Canberra and Queanbeyan, although even in this Canberra is unlike other Australian cities. Jones points out the lack of ethnic segregation in Canberra compared with Melbourne. There is some residential segregation by socio-economic status, but whatever their predilection for fellow ethnic neighbours, the major determinant of where a family lives in Canberra is when they arrived there. All land is leased for development and new suburbs are only developed as others become fully occupied. In Queanbeyan some Polish families live near each other, but the whole town is so small, and the actual numbers involved so few, that no evidence of close settlement was found.

---

1 One Polish family had recently moved from a small town in order to be near an ethnic club and Saturday School.

2 Jones 1961
Other factors considered likely to affect language maintenance were:

(a) the pre-arrival level of education of parents
(b) present occupation of parents
(c) the migration history and length of residence of parents in Australia
(d) whether or not the parents were naturalised
(e) the religious affiliation of the family
(f) affiliation with ethnic organisations by parents and attendance at ethnic schools by children.
(g) contact with grandparents, relatives and other adult friends who are mother tongue speakers.
(h) attitude of parents towards the retention of their original language.
(i) attitudes of children towards maintenance of their mother tongue.
(j) ability of parents to organise language maintenance activities for their children (attendance at ethnic school and visits to homeland).
(k) sex of the children.
(l) size of the family and the position of the child in it.

There is a more detailed discussion of the possible relevance of these factors to the children's performance in later chapters.
Analysis of Data

The responses to questions about language use were assigned numbers. 'Never' scored zero, 'sometimes' scored one and 'always' scored two. They were totalled and an index was constructed using the responses to questions relating to children's production of their mother tongue; (questions 8, 11, 15, 25, 27 and 29) this index is referred to as the Active Usage Scale. The total possible score is twelve, and the highest actually achieved by Polish children was ten and by Dutch children eight. A score of ten implies that amongst family and fellow ethnic friends the children were using their mother tongue very frequently. There were only four children without siblings and their scores were not standardised.

This scale somewhat resembles that constructed by Hoffman. As a teacher he was concerned about the effects of bilingualism upon school performance; therefore he devised and administered a questionnaire to schoolchildren of mainly Jewish and Italian origin in three New York schools. His bilingual schedule was designed to bring out the children's bilingual background. One-third of the questions were directed towards the children's own language use and two-thirds refer to the rest of the family. The answers were scored and the average considered a bilingual score. Hoffman correlated

\[1\] Hoffman 1934

\[2\] Hoffman 1934
this score with such factors as the intelligence of the children and their ethnic background. Hoffman's schedule has since been used by other investigators; Haugen\(^1\), however, describing it as a measure of language competence regrets that there is no correlation of the scores with socio-demographic information about the family such as length of residence and educational opportunities.

Hoffman, of course, was not concerned with language maintenance, but rather with the harmful effects or otherwise of bilingualism.

The author has attempted to go some way towards implementing Haugen's suggestions. The scores of Polish and Dutch children on the Active Usage Scale are correlated with scores derived from their responses to questions about their passive bilingual background. These scores (from questions 7, 14, 24, 26 and 28) indicate the language usage of others in the family to the children. Further correlation between scores for other activities and areas such as books in the home and letters received were not undertaken since nearly every family had books and received letters in their national language.

In the present survey an appearance of greater statistical precision could be given to the scores on the Active Usage Scale if 'sometimes' were to be further divided and Hoffman\(^2\) in their

\(^1\) Haugen p. 94
\(^2\) Fishman 1968b
\(^3\) Hoffman 1934
surveys used five point divisions, and thus obtained a finer
discrimination of usage. However, the author preferred
'sometimes' because the differentiation made by the children
was very variable and imprecise. Although such accurate
scoring may be possible amongst intellectually sophisticated
adults, experience with this survey suggests that amongst children
the divisions are very arbitrary.

The reliability of the scores on the Active Usage Scale
could only be assessed empirically; the scores of the children
corresponded with the author's subjective impressions of their
familiarity with and use of their mother tongue. At the time
of the survey the author knew of no comparable studies, but at
least one has been carried out since 1968.

The range of scores of the Polish and Dutch groups of
children were remarkably different and the scale could thus be
considered valuable in differentiating between these groups.

---

1 Fishman 1968 describes his own difficulty in relying on the
accuracy of scores based on quantifying responses about
language practice.

2 Private communication - R. Wiseman, Adelaide.
The median score for the Polish children was five, and for the Dutch children between zero and one.

There is some indication that the variable tested by the Scale is unidimensional. Guttman's scalogram analysis for determining whether or not a collection of statements taps a common dimension was applied. Since there were only 34 Polish children and 25 Dutch children whose responses could be used, their numbers are well below the one hundred recommended by Guttman for scalogram analysis. Nevertheless, the pattern of responses conforms to the kind found in the attitude measurement for which this scaling is generally used. The endorsement of the most extreme statement is associated with endorsement of the less extreme statements. In this instance the statements are about the children's speech to members of their environment whose rank order is constant. The most extreme response was the use of mother tongue for prayers and then, in descending order, to peers, to siblings, to older friends of the family, to mother and to father. The analysis for the Polish and Dutch groups is shown in Appendix IV. The ranking which appears in this analysis suggests that this may be the order in which children give up speaking their mother tongue i.e. children will continue to speak to their fathers in mother tongue longer than to anyone else. Conversely, the child who always prays in his mother tongue is likely to be using it on all other possible occasions which are included in this analysis.
The scores of the children were compared with the socio-demographic factors considered relevant and the chi-squared test with Yates correction for small frequencies used to determine, for each comparison, the probability of obtaining by chance a difference as large or larger than that actually obtained. Although the samples were so small there were several differences significantly unlikely to occur by chance.

Thirty-eight families of Polish origin were approached by the author; one father, and no mother, refused to take part in the survey. Although one father refused to give information himself, he allowed his wife to answer the parents' questionnaire. In two families there was no father in the home, but in one case he had left only days before the interview.

Jean Martin 1965

Thus the totals for 'father' and 'mother' in the Polish group are usually 35.
CHAPTER THREE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents demographic information obtained from the two groups of families, 37 of Polish origin and 50 of Dutch origin, interviewed by the author.

Thirty-eight families of Polish origin were approached by the author; one family declined to take part in the survey. Of the remaining 37 families, two were the product of 'mixed' marriages between a Polish mother and, in one case a Czechoslovakian father, and in the other case a Yugoslavian father. In both families Polish was spoken by the children and their mothers, and occasionally fathers, and the children were attending classes at the Saturday School run by the White Eagle Club, the Polish national club in Canberra. In two other families in the group surveyed there was no mother in the home, and in two there was no father.

Fifty Dutch families were interviewed by the author; no family approached refused to take part in the survey. Although one father refused to give information himself, he allowed his wife to answer the parents' questionnaire. In two families there was no father in the home, but in one case he had left only days before the interview.

---

1Thus the totals for 'father' and 'mother' in the Polish group are usually 35.
and the mother gave full information about him. In three families one parent had died; there were two stepfathers and one stepmother; the author treated these as parents for the purpose of the interview, since they were the people the child spoke to daily as a parent.

One couple from Friesland were bilingual in Dutch and Frisian, speaking Frisian at home and some Dutch with friends. Their child spoke English only, but did recognise some common Frisian words, although she could not really distinguish between Dutch and Frisian.

In two other families there were Frisian fathers and Dutch mothers, but Dutch was the language of the home.

1 As a result of mothers' information there are only a few tables relating to the Dutch group where the totals for father are less than 50.

1 One lived in Spain, Germany and Austria after leaving Poland, and one couple spent some time in England.
Birthplace and Migration History

All the parents in the 37 Polish families were born outside Australia, nearly all in Poland. One mother was born in the Ukraine and one in Germany; in 27 of the families both parents had spent some time in Germany and many were married there. In only seven families had neither parent lived outside Poland and Australia. Ten of the 37 children were born in Poland, all the rest were born in Australia, mostly in New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory (many of the children had siblings born in Germany before their parents migrated to Australia).

All parents in the Dutch group were born outside Australia, mostly in Holland. The father in one family and the stepmother in another were born and raised in Indonesia; the stepmother was multilingual, her family being originally Armenian, but long resident in the Dutch East Indies. One mother, although born in Holland, was of Danish family and grew up speaking Dutch and Danish; her children did not speak Danish. Three parents had come to Australia as teenagers with their families, and had subsequently married here. Twelve fathers had lived and worked in places other than Holland and Australia; the countries included Germany, Indonesia, America, France, England and parts of Asia; two fathers had worked in four countries and one

---

1 One lived in Spain, Germany and Austria after leaving Poland, and one couple spent some time in England.
The periods abroad ranged from one to five years. Three mothers had spent short periods abroad in France, Switzerland and Indonesia. Eleven children were born in Holland, the rest in Australia, mainly in New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory, but some families had been in several States; one family had three children born in three different States.

**Date of Arrival and Naturalisation**

As already described, the two groups surveyed could be considered as contrasting types of migrant; the Dutch were predominantly economic, voluntary migrants, whereas the Polish group was not homogeneous. Most were refugee migrants, but some were probably economic migrants.

The Polish families arrived in Australia between 1949 and 1963, in two waves. Many families came from refugee camps in Germany between 1949 and 1956; they had decided not to go back to Poland or were unable to do so for political reasons. The second wave started in the late fifties, with migrants who came directly from Poland and were, therefore, probably not political refugees; it seems probable that they should be regarded as economic, voluntary migrants.

All the families in the survey were eligible to apply for naturalisation since all had been in Australia more than five years.
The following table shows arrival dates and naturalisation for Polish families. A division of the group has been made at 1957 since this seems to mark the change in type of migrant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.1</th>
<th>Arrival dates and naturalisation of Polish families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrived before 1957 or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalised</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not naturalised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naturalisation has been suggested as a possible measure of subjective assimilation by migrants. This would be a difficult position to support in the Polish case, particularly where migrants are not politically sympathetic to their country's current government; some of the parents in the Polish groups studied may in fact have been rendered stateless after the Second World War, when they decided not to return to Poland.

A more positive indication of satisfaction with their new country and identification of the way of life there may be migrants' desire to spend the rest of their life in Australia. The question

---

1 c.f. The 1958 survey by Alan Richardson of British Migrants in Western Australia reported in Taft From Stranger to Citizen p.p. 46-50. Richardson considers that no acculturation can take place without identification with Australia and that a prerequisite for identification was satisfaction with life here.
to this effect was included in the parents' questionnaire; the parents were given a choice of three categories and the results for the Polish group were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3:2</th>
<th>Polish parents' preference for remaining in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fathers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to stay</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to leave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An affirmative answer does not necessarily imply identification with the new country, and there are no objective criteria to indicate the relationship of wanting to stay with the parents' level of acculturation. However, even considering these limitations, clearly more than half of Polish parents expressed themselves as wanting to stay, and were also naturalised citizens.

The Dutch families had arrived in Australia also between 1947 and 1963; all were voluntary migrants, and although some were assisted to migrate by the Dutch Government, many had paid their own fare. They were, of course, able to return to Holland when they could afford it, and quite a number had already been back for a visit. Dates of arrival and naturalisation figures are shown in Table 3:3. To facilitate comparison with the Polish group the arrivals have also been divided at 1957, although no change in the type of Dutch migrant occurred in that year.
Arrival dates and naturalisation of Dutch families

The ages of the parents varied widely in both groups as is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arrived before 1957</th>
<th>Arrived 1957 or later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalised</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not naturalised</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question about satisfaction with Australia was answered by the Dutch parents as follows:

Dutch parents’ preference for remaining in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Want to stay</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the satisfaction with life here was higher for Dutch parents, although the proportion of Dutch families who were naturalised Australians (33 out of 50) was lower than that for the Polish group (23 out of 37). Only nine Dutch families either wanted to leave Australia or expressed themselves as uncertain about wanting to stay. Amongst the Polish families 14 out of the 37 fathers were either uncertain or wanted to leave.1

---

1 Survey by Gough reported in Taft p. 56 - (The Dutch) “are slow to become naturalised as they do not wish to exchange their own Queen for the Queen of England”.

2 2 fathers missing
2 2 mothers missing
The ages of the parents ranged widely in both groups as is shown in the following tables:

### TABLE 3:5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polish Parents' Age Range</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ages of the parents in the Dutch group were as follows:

### TABLE 3:6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch Parents' Age Range</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no notable differences between the two groups, although there were proportionately more young mothers amongst the Polish group and a slightly higher percentage of fathers over 45 amongst the Poles.

### Education

The amount of schooling received by the parents in the Polish group varied widely. One mother and one father reported no schooling at all, possibly because of the disruptions of war. Three fathers were academics with degrees gained both in Europe and Australia.

---

1 2 fathers missing
2 2 mothers missing
Table 3:7 shows levels of education. Also shown is the number of parents who started or completed apprenticeship training, either before they came to Australia or since arriving.

**TABLE 3:7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polish parents' level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part primary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete primary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part secondary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete secondary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part tertiary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Apprenticeship**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part apprenticeship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete apprenticeship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disruptions of war, forced labour, imprisonment and camp life would explain in part the lack of technical trade qualifications amongst the Polish parents.

Figures for the Dutch group are shown in Table 3:8.
TABLE 3:8

Dutch parents' level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part primary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete primary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part secondary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete secondary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part tertiary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete tertiary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part apprenticeship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete apprenticeship</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only had half the Dutch fathers trade qualifications, but 43 out of 49 also had at least some secondary education, compared with rather less than half of the Polish fathers (17 out of 37). On the other hand, seven Polish fathers had some tertiary education, but only six Dutch fathers.

The conditions of migration to Australia are a possible explanation; the Poles were very often displaced persons or 'refugee' migrants, who had had little opportunity to acquire craft skills. However, many of those who had the appropriate intellectual calibre did attain university education, either overseas or in Australia. The Netherlands' Government assisted

1 One father missing.
many Dutch migrants to come to Australia, and particularly encouraged
the migration of skilled tradesmen who were in short supply in
Australia.

**Occupation**

This section compares the occupations of the parents of both
groups. These occupations are categorised and compared with those
for the parents of sixth grade Canberra children from English speaking
homes obtained from Keeves survey\(^1\) and with figures for the Australian
workforce.

The occupations of parents are classified into seven groups
derived from the occupational code and rank developed from the
Australian Census Classification by Broom, Jones and Zubrzycki\(^2\).

The groups are constituted as follows:

I. Consists of group 1. - upper professional, group 2. graziers,
wheat and sheep farmers, group 3. lower professional.

II. Consists of groups 4, 5 and 6 - managerial, self employed,
shop proprietors and other farmers.

III. Consists of groups 7 and 8 - clerical and related workers,
members of armed forces and police force.

\(^1\) In a study undertaken in Australian Capital Territory in 1968 Keeves
initially surveyed all sixth grade children who spoke English at home;
hence nearly all were of Australian or British parentage.

\(^2\) Broom, Jones and Zubrzycki 1965
IV Consists of group 9 only - craftsmen and foremen.

V Consists of groups 10, 11 and 12 - shop assistants, operatives, process workers and drivers.

VI Consists of four groups, 13, 14, 15 and 16 - personal and domestic and other service workers, miners, farm and rural workers and labourers.

VII Consists of occupations inadequately defined or not stated.

A comparison of occupations of fathers of grade six children in Canberra obtained from Keeves' survey and of the Polish and Dutch groups interviewed by the author is shown in Table 3:9. The figures from the 1966 Census for the Australian male workforce are included. It is clear that there are marked differences between the Polish and Dutch groups.

TABLE 3:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Categories</th>
<th>All Grade 6</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Australian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Only 9 Dutch women were working as many still had young children at home. Twenty-one Polish mothers were employed, 15 of them in domestic service occupations, or in occupations not adequately defined. Canberra is lacking in industrial employment for women, but two women were employed in clerical positions and four as shop assistants.
The occupations of the Dutch fathers are concentrated around categories II, IV and VI. Most of those in category II were men who owned their own businesses, connected with the construction industry (e.g. several painting contractors, a stonemason, a manufacturer of concrete products, insulation contractor.) Many of the men in category IV were also employed in the building industry; they were nearly all craftsmen with qualifications obtained through apprenticeship and technical school attendance in Holland. The occupations of Dutch fathers are concentrated around categories II and IV.

As might be expected there are few Polish fathers employed in occupations requiring trade or technical qualifications; slightly under 11% of the Polish fathers were so employed. On the other hand nearly half the fathers were employed in unskilled manual occupations represented by category VI. Compared with the Canberra sample of fathers of sixth grade children, the number of fathers in unskilled occupations is in striking contrast; only 7% of the fathers in Keeves' survey were engaged in unskilled manual occupations. The Dutch are similarly represented in category VI; whereas the Poles are very much over-represented in this category.

Some of the differences noted are due to the particular conditions operating in Canberra. The population of Canberra is not typical of the rest of urban Australia. F.L. Jones notes that

---

1 There is a similar concentration in Hempel's Queensland Sample (Hempel 1960)

2 Jones 1961
it is a young city; according to the 1961 census 83% of the population were under 45, compared with 72% in Australia as a whole. Since it is the seat of government and the national capital, Canberra's industrial structure is also distinctive. In 1961 38% of the workforce was employed under the Public Service Act, and a further 7% were defence personnel. Seven percent of the workforce were employed by Australian National University and C.S.I.R.O. Only 8% was employed in manufacturing compared with a national figure in 1961 of 28%. The main source of blue collar employment in Canberra is the building and construction industry, which employs 22% of the male workforce in Canberra, compared with a national figure of 12%. Thirty-seven percent of the Canberra male workforce is foreign born, and in the building and construction industry 61% of the workers are foreign born.

Contacts with Ethnic Friends and Organisations

In Canberra and Queanbeyan many families maintained links with their ethnic culture through their membership of the White Eagle Club in Canberra, and the Polish Club in Queanbeyan. These organisations are explicitly devoted to maintaining Polish culture, as well as to social fellowship and assistance of various kinds. Classes where children can learn to read and write as well as speak correct Polish, and learn some of the history, geography and traditions of their ancestors, are conducted by the clubs, and known as the Saturday Schools. Even members whose links with the club are purely social usually take their children to the Christmas parties there.
Some families go rarely, despite their wish to, and their children do not attend Saturday School because of transport difficulties rather than lack of interest; without a private motor car the club is difficult to reach from some parts of Canberra, particularly Narrabundah, where some poorer families live. By contrast, in Queanbeyan most families are within walking distance of the club.

Not all who attend the club are members; more fathers than mothers reported attending regularly, but amongst the Polish group only seven mothers reported never going to the club. Only nine fathers never go, seven reported attending regularly and 19 reported occasional attendance.

Like the Polish group nearly all the Dutch parents met Dutch speaking friends although there were two couples who stated that they never did. Twenty-one couples regularly met Dutch friends and 27 couples did so occasionally. However, membership of the Dutch Club was confined to twelve couples, of whom only four attended regularly. Many of the 38 couples who stated that they did not belong made a point of saying that they did not want to keep formal links with the Dutch speaking community.

There is no separate school in Canberra where children can learn Dutch; this may reflect the attitude of the community towards maintaining the Dutch language. There is no junior branch of the Dutch Club, but some children attended functions at the Club with their parents.
Religion

All the Polish families were nominally Roman Catholic, although in one instance the mother came from a Jewish family (the children in this family enjoyed all the festivals of both Catholic and Jewish calendars). Twenty-five of the children attended Catholic primary schools, the other twelve attended State primary schools.

There were 19 Catholic children in the Dutch group of whom twelve attended Catholic primary schools; the other 31 children were Protestants, of whom only two were members of the Dutch Reformed Church.¹

¹ Thus there was no evidence available as to whether this church in Canberra reinforces language maintenance amongst Dutch people c.f. Zubrzycki 1964.
Children's Sex, Age and Position in the Family

Of the 37 Polish children, 19 were boys and 18 girls, and their ages ranged from ten to twelve years. The number of children and their position in the family were as follows:

**TABLE 3:10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of child</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with the Polish group it can be seen that there were more large families amongst the Dutch. There are 16 Polish children who are first or only children, but only nine Polish children come from such large families. The reason for this difference between the groups may be due to the tradition of large families among the Dutch. Including the three 'only children' amongst the Poles, and the one only child amongst the Dutch, 15 of the Dutch children interviewed are the youngest in

Heimpel mentions a similar finding in Queensland – Heimpel 1960.
TABLE 3:11

Children's Sex, Age and Position in the Family - Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY SIZE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position of child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12341-1-1-1-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5811-1-1-1-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-211-1-1-1-1-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-112111-1-1-1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1111-1-1-1-1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-11-111111112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-111111111113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-111111111111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-111111111111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-111111111111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-111111111111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-111111111111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with the Polish group it can be seen that there were more large families amongst the Dutch. There are 16 Polish children who are first or second in their families, compared with 28 Dutch children. Nearly half the Dutch children (23) are from families of five or more, but only nine Polish children come from such large families. The reason for this difference between the groups may be due to the tradition of large families among the Dutch. Including the three 'only children' amongst the Poles, and the one only child amongst the Dutch, 15 of the Dutch children interviewed are the youngest in their families, whereas 19 of the Polish children were the youngest in their families. The Polish children whose parents had migrated after 1957 had one or two years of schooling in Poland, whereas the Dutch children were over 13 years old. / ueensland - Hempel 1960.

1 Hempel mentions a similar finding in Queensland - Hempel 1960.
the family, whereas 19 of the Polish children are the youngest in their families.

School

Three of the Polish children whose parents had migrated after 1957 had one or two years school in Poland; the rest had received all their education in Australia. Eleven girls and 14 boys attended Catholic primary schools in Canberra and Queanbeyan, seven girls and five boys attended government primary schools. Only one child spontaneously reported having any difficulty with English at school; this child had come to Australia when nearly seven years old, and according to the mother was also very shy.

All the Dutch children were in sixth grade, attending Canberra schools and their ages ranged from eleven to 13 years. Twelve of the Dutch children attended Catholic primary schools; 38 attended government primary schools. All the Dutch children had started school in Australia, but four had had some schooling in Holland on visits there with their parents. None of the Dutch children reported any difficulty with English at school, but some of the parents mentioned the children's problems with English spelling, particularly where English and Dutch words were alike. Three Dutch parents also said that they had been advised to try and speak English at home by school teachers; one Polish family mentioned receiving such advice. The author was not enquiring into the difficulties faced by bilingual children in an English
language society, but there was naturally quite a lot of discussion about it by both parents and children.

Twenty-two of the Polish children had seen grandparents or

two families had visited Poland in the year before the survey. 8/7%

Of the 37 children in the Polish group surveyed only three said that they never saw children of Polish parentage. When asked about

their friends, 17 reported their friends to be mostly Australian, but 35/7%

they saw some Polish children, 13 said their friends were 'some Polish

and some Australian', four had mostly Polish friends; 36 children

reported playing at home with Australian children and going to their homes.

The kinds of contacts with relatives varied; in some cases

grandparents were actually living in the homes with the families.

The children met other Polish children when they went to

Saturday School or to functions at the Polish clubs; 19 of the children

reported going to such functions. They also met other adults and

children at church.

10/7%

Thirty-five of the Dutch children reported that their friends

were mostly Australian, three reported their friends to be of other nationalities and twelve children said that they had some Dutch and some Australian friends; only two Dutch children said that they never saw any other Dutch children, but none had most of their friends among Dutch children. All the Dutch children said that they had visited Australian friends at home and had Australian children to their own homes.
Contact with Relatives

59% Twenty-two of the Polish children had seen grandparents or other relatives, and 18 had relatives living in Canberra or Queanbeyan; two families had visited Poland in the year before the survey. Thirty-nine of the Dutch children had had contact with their grandparents or relatives and 22 had relatives in Canberra. Six families had visited Holland and two more were expected to go within a year of the author's interview. In these two families the children were attempting to learn Dutch so that they could speak to relatives in Holland.

The kinds of contacts with relatives varied; in some cases grandparents were actually living in the homes with the families. Sometimes grandparents had migrated twenty years before, and it was their children who were parents of the children surveyed. There were no reports of Polish relatives coming on short visits from Poland, but amongst the Dutch families this was not uncommon.

The third part of the chapter relates the children's scores on the Active Usage Scale with a number of sociological and demographic factors considered to have a possible explanatory relation to the pattern of scores.

1See Chapter II 30
CHAPTER FOUR

INTRODUCTION

This chapter records the sociolinguistic data for Polish parents and children derived from the two questionnaires. The chapter is divided into three parts, the first part dealing with the parents' attitudes to the retention of Polish and the value of bilingualism in general. There is some information on the choice of language in the home by parents and children, as reported by the parents, and compared with the children's report. The second part of the chapter is concerned with the children's answers about their own and their family's language usage at home and among friends outside the home. As well as questions of domain and usage there are questions about the children's attitude to bilingualism, both their own and what they would like for their own children.

The third part of the chapter relates the children's scores on the Active Usage Scale \(^1\) with a number of sociological and demographic factors considered to have a possible explanatory relation to the pattern of scores.

\(^1\) See Chapter II

---

1 See Chapter II
Languages Spoken by Parents

The number of languages other than their own which parents could speak was considered as a possible factor influencing parents' attitude towards children retaining their mother tongue. If parents considered languages valuable, either economically or giving cultural advantages to themselves and their children, it was thought that they might encourage children to retain the bilingualism of their early years.

As already noted 29 fathers and 27 mothers had spent some time in Germany; these reported that they spoke German, although they sometimes qualified this with the proviso that they would need some practice in it before they were fluent. Other languages commonly spoken were Russian and French. One father spoke six languages as well as Polish and English. The number of languages other than Polish and English spoken by parents is recorded in Table 4:1.

TABLE 4:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Languages</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Value of Bilingualism

All the Polish parents thought it useful to have two or more languages; in the open-ended question as to why, the reasons given ranged from 'being able to talk to more people' to 'broadening cultural understanding between peoples'. It was possible to divide the reasons into four broad headings:

(i) Cultural - which included love of their Polish culture and heritage in particular, as well as general cultural considerations.

(ii) Economic - including the value of being able to be employed as an interpreter as well as the general possibility of getting better jobs if multi-lingual.¹

(iii) Travel

(iv) Communication - which includes being able to mix with a wider group of people as well as keeping up with friends and relatives. Some parents who gave this as a reason were clearly thinking of their own migration experiences and difficulties.

¹This was presumably based on parents' European experience. In some countries competence in another language brings an automatic increase in salary, but this is not so in Australia; only three of the parents had jobs which were in any way connected with their linguistic abilities; two of these were academics and one was in business trading with Poland.
Some parents gave more than one answer; one parent gave all four reasons. In this question there did not appear to be any differences between mothers and fathers. The answers are tabulated in Table 4:2.

**Table 4:2**

| Parents' reasons for value of bilingualism |   
|------------------------------------------|---
| (i) Cultural                             | 14 |
| (ii) Economic                            | 15 |
| (iii) Travel                             | 17 |
| (iv) Communication                       | 33 |

**Acquaintance with English**

It was thought that the parents who were fluent in English, or who had attempted to learn the language, might be less interested in retaining their ethnic language with their children in Australia. Some national groups are known to favour retention of their mother tongue, chiefly so that older and younger members of the family can communicate; Mapstone describes such a situation amongst a group of Macedonians in Victoria. In such groups the older people, and particularly the women, have not learnt English. However, amongst the Polish group only eleven fathers and twelve mothers had learnt any English before coming to Australia. Twelve fathers and 15 mothers had attended classes after arrival. The author very occasionally had difficulty in being sure she was understood, but only rarely had trouble in understanding the Polish adults interviewed; it is surely a tribute to the determination of these that so many of them were able to learn English so well with little formal teaching.

1 Mapstone (465)
Preference for language spoken in the home

Parents were asked what language they preferred their children to speak at home. In the thirty-three families with both parents at home Polish was preferred by at least one parent in every case.\(^1\)

One mother preferred English and three wanted both Polish and English. Three fathers wanted both. On the whole Polish was uniformly popular with parents for their own children, and even more popular for their grandchildren. In five families some doubts were expressed about the probability of their wish being granted; otherwise all the families wanted grandchildren to speak Polish.

In the four one parent families, two parents preferred Polish, one English and one wanted both. Thus in 36 households there was at least one parent wanting children to speak Polish. The strength and expression of this preference may have varied, but only four families said they did not try and keep the language up, and two of these were single parent families.

In the face of such a weight of preference it is interesting to note that only five children said they preferred Polish, and a further five said they liked both languages. This disparity may have caused tension between parents and children; certainly some parents were concerned that they could not maintain Polish speaking once the family moved to Canberra, they became active members of Polish Language School and Learning Polish.

\(^1\) In 26 families both parents preferred Polish.
at home. Most, however, seemed to have compromised, particularly with their grandchildren. They sang songs in Polish but otherwise talked to them in English.

Parents' ethnic contacts and language usage

Regardless of their attitude to Polish language maintenance, the language environment which parents could provide for their children was affected by the availability of mother tongue speakers beyond the immediate family circle. Their fellow ethnic friends, members of ethnic organisations, members of religious orders speaking their mother tongue and relatives could all reinforce national language loyalty and practice. Conversely a family remote from other people speaking Polish might succeed in retaining its use for domestic matters at home, but would have more difficulty in giving their children a broad acquaintance with the language, and the children would be even more affected by the dominance of English in their environment.  

1 This situation was well illustrated by one family in the survey who had recently arrived from a country town, where there were no other Polish speakers; the parents were together all day running a shop and, therefore, spoke English all the time to their customers and to their child, who was in the shop with them. The child spoke and understood little or no Polish. However, once the family moved to Canberra, they became active members of the White Eagle Club and the child was attending Saturday School and learning Polish.
Some families kept only informal links with their past through friendship with their fellow Poles, but no family interviewed was completely out of touch with some fellow countryman.

**Parents’ language usage with family and friends**

Nearly all the children heard their parents (where they had two) speak Polish to each other; even in the two mixed marriages Polish was used as well as the other Slavonic language concerned. All the parents spoke Polish to each other when with Polish friends, whether indoors or outside the house\(^1\); however, they did not always speak Polish to their children outside the house. One mother and one father reported that they never spoke Polish to their children outside the house, 14 mothers reported that they sometimes used English, as did 13 fathers.

\(^1\)The question about whether they spoke outside the house, was meant to elicit their attitude to speaking Polish in front of Australians; this question was not a success, for a number of parents said spontaneously after they had completed their questionnaire that, of course, they never spoke Polish if Australians were present. The author thinks that in fact they must have read ‘outside the house’ as meaning picnics etc.
Amongst both Polish and Dutch families, the mothers often expressed the feeling that children resented the parents speaking Polish or Dutch in front of Australian children. None of the children ever mentioned this spontaneously to the author, and denied any such embarrassment. It seems likely, however, that the parents were right about this, but in the absence of supporting evidence it is not possible to draw any definite conclusions.

**Mother's language usage with children**

In the children's questionnaire children were asked to describe the language spoken at home by mother, father, siblings and themselves. In the parents' questionnaire the mother was asked in what language the children replied. The author considered it would be useful to compare mother's and child's reports of their language usage, as some check on the agreement in the family, if not the actual facts of use. In only a few cases were there discrepancies in the replies.

---

1. Because of the number of children who said they preferred English 'because everyone else does'.

2. Mothers were asked as being the person most likely to answer questions and also person talking most to children.
### Table 4:3

**Children's use of Polish as reported by mother and child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polish spoken by mother to child</th>
<th>Mother's report</th>
<th>Child's report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polish spoken by child to mother</th>
<th>Mother's report</th>
<th>Child's report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The children's report of which language they used when talking to their mothers (question 27.) does not always tally exactly, but there were no outstanding discrepancies.

### Children's standard of Polish speaking assessed by mother and child

The author asked both mother and child whether the child spoke Polish 'well', 'fairly well' or 'badly'. There were no objective standards for these categories, the author relying on the mother to assess how well a child of this age should speak; some parents undoubtedly had different standards of assessment, and took the local environment into account, as did the children.
Speaking Polish 'well' may have meant 'as well as could be expected in an Australian environment'. For more recent arrivals, the mothers seemed to take less account of the dominance of English.

| TABLE 4:4 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Children's standard of Polish speaking by mother and child |
| Mother's report | Child's report |
| Well            | 9               | 10              |
| Fairly well     | 17              | 18              |
| Badly           | 35              | 37              |

Thus, these reports do not give an objective, and only an approximate, standard of linguistic proficiency. No doubt the sophistication of vocabulary and grammar of the language of the home varied as much within the families surveyed, as it would in a similarly constituted English speaking group of families.

**CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES TO MOTHER TONGUE RETENTION**

At their age the children were clearly aware that speaking the Polish language was emotionally valuable to their parents. At the same time, in the Polish group, most of the children were still bilingual to the extent of speaking some Polish on some occasions at home. Their attitudes to the value of bilingualism for themselves are probably coloured not only by their feelings for their families, but also by their perception of the value to them of Polish in later life. Further indication of their attitudes is given in their answers to a question as to whether or not they would like
their own children to be bilingual, and if so in what languages.

In both Polish and Dutch groups the children probably varied widely in intelligence and linguistic aptitude. They also varied in their attitudes to their own and their family's language usage; as might be expected, the answers to questions did not always give a coherent tidy picture of attitude and practice. Sometimes the children were aware of this, sometimes they had clearly never considered questions of language or bilingualism at all. As indications of attitudes the children's answers, like the parents', must be viewed with caution. The child may not have been candid deliberately, particularly if there was tension in the family over keeping up Polish. Early in the questionnaire the children were asked if they would study Polish in high school if it were possible (question 18.).

Twenty-seven said yes, six said no and four were undecided. Those who said yes may have done so because they perceived that already knowing some Polish, would give them an advantage; they may have said yes because such study would please their parents, or there may have been other reasons. Those saying no may be indicating a dislike for Polish, but could also be reflecting a realistic assessment of their own inadequacy in Polish.

Children's attitudes to bilingualism and preferred language

Thirty-five children thought it useful to be bilingual and two did not think it was useful. Of the 35 children who thought it useful themselves, 32 wanted their own children to be bilingual.
The reasons they gave somewhat resemble those given by their parents. Sometimes they clearly echoed parents' remarks upon the subject. Some children saw the question as in some way referring to a subject for school study, rather than their own bilingual situation. Most, however, took it as a question of their attitude to their own situation.

The responses fall under seven headings for both the children and their own putative children. These categories are as follows:

(i) Cultural - in the case of the children specifically Polish or Dutch national culture 'to keep up our family' or 'they should know the language of where I came from'.

(ii) Economic - 'to be an interpreter', 'useful for the export business'.

(iii) Travel - which included the possibility of returning to Poland or Holland to live.

(iv) Talking to other migrants - this was in the sense of helping other newcomers to translating, as well as keeping up with family friends and acquaintances.

(v) Talking to family - 'so I can talk to Mum' as well as 'so I can talk to my Dutch cousins'.

(vi) Education - this included 'you have to study a language at High School' and 'two languages helps you learn a third'.

When the Polish and Dutch children were thinking about their own use for the language they chose certain categories, most of which this often meant secrets that they could have with fellow ethnic friends, and thereby maintain a certain identity. The children said it was useful to be able to decipher.

It is interesting to note that Polish children in particular were ready to maintain a Polish heritage, twelve of them saw themselves as wanting this for their own children. Perhaps they found it easier to identify with this idea at a distance. The children were realistic about Polish helping family communication.
When the Polish and Dutch children were thinking about their own use for two languages they added another category, that of secrets. This often meant secrets that they could have with fellow ethnic friends, and thereby tantalise Australian children. Twice children said it was useful to be able to eavesdrop.

Most children gave more than one reason. The Polish children responded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>For self</th>
<th>For own children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to others</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to family</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.5

Reasons for valuing bilingualism

It is interesting that although only two children were ready to commit themselves to maintaining a Polish heritage, twelve of them saw themselves as wanting this for their own children. Perhaps they found it easier to identify with this idea at a distance. The children were realistic about Polish helping family communication.

Children's language preference

All the children were asked which language they preferred to use. Twenty-five preferred English, five said they liked both
Polish and English, five preferred Polish\(^1\). Twenty-one of the 25 preferring English did so because they found it easier, more familiar; the other four did so specifically to conform with their Australian peers. Two children who preferred Polish said they found it easier; the others thought it prettier than English.

As with other answers reflecting attitudes to Polish or English, the children's answers should be treated with caution. However, in this case the researcher felt the children were answering truthfully; it was near the end of the questionnaire and most were quite relaxed.

**Attendance at Saturday School**

The children were asked whether they had experienced any formal teaching in their mother tongue, and 25 of them had at some time attended a Saturday School. It was thought that the children might not enjoy an activity which placed them apart from their Australian peers and took up part of the time they might regard as leisure from school. To the question of whether or not they enjoyed Saturday School, 18 reported that they did; however, this answer is suspect. In two instances where the children reported that they liked Saturday School their mothers spontaneously mentioned that in

---

\(^1\)The two girl children from 'mixed' marriages said they preferred their father's language.
fact these children refused to go at all. Several other mothers
volunteered that children were bored or disliked the lessons, although
the children had not said so.

Atti tu.des of prejudice experienced by children

The author also thought that some picture of the child's
attitude to an English speaking environment might be gained by asking
about his perception of Australian attitudes to speaking another
language. The children were asked whether Australians seemed
curious or annoyed when hearing Polish or Dutch spoken in front of
them, only seven of the children said that they thought Australians
were curious; only two children reported Australians as being annoyed.

Again these answers are suspect as a true indication of attitude by
the children; in at least two cases parents volunteered that children
had been teased and several other parents referred to the hostility
of Australians in the streets or in public transport if they heard
a foreign language spoken.

None of the children had had any experience of teachers
forbidding them to speak Polish; on the contrary, several had been
asked to do so by their teachers to allow other children to hear how
the language sounded. One family reported that a child had been
punished for speaking Polish in a school playground in a city else­
where in Australia, but such attitudes, if they existed at all, were
not widespread in the schools in Australian Capital Territory.

The author did question the head teachers of both Catholic and
Government primary schools, and all stated that it was not their
practice to reprove children for speaking their mother tongue.

Church attendance and language usage

Thirty-four children reported that they went to church, and 27 of these sometimes or always heard the service in Polish. However, 22 of the children said their prayers only in English, five used both languages and seven said their prayers in Polish; only one child reported never saying prayers.

In the United States, where ethnic parishes have been in existence for over a century, their church has sometimes played a major role in supporting immigrants' national language maintenance; at the same time the church is dependent upon the attitude of its parishioners. If most of the congregation has come to speak English there is often pressure on the priest to have services in English rather than a national language, which may be less and less used amongst young people.

Children's contact with relatives

The children were often in touch with relatives, 18 of them had relatives living in Canberra or Queanbeyan, four other children had relatives in other parts of Australia, or had recently visited them overseas. The children's use of Polish was reinforced by this contact with their relatives, since of the 22 who were in touch with their relatives 17 of them usually spoke to them in Polish.

Fishman and Nahirny, Lemaire in Fishman 1966.
Their exact usage is shown in Table 4:6.

All the children reported meeting Polish speaking friends of their parents, and only five of them reported using English alone to such adults. Of course, their speech to such adults may have been no more than 'good-evening', 'good night' and 'yes and no', but some certainly had much more extensive conversation.

Language used with fellow ethnic peers

With their peers, however, the children nearly always used English. Of the 34 children reporting some Polish friends, only 12 ever used Polish when speaking to them, and this was nearly always to keep secrets from mono-lingual Australian children.

Major domains of usage

The majority of questions in this study were directed to discovering the domains of usage of these children, and particularly the people to whom they spoke Polish.

The Polish children's usage of mother tongue

Even in so small a group as this there were wide variations in the children's experience. For example some children had all their relatives living nearby; in these families they would commonly be seeing relatives regularly and, therefore, hear more Polish spoken in the family circle than would the child of a single parent family. Children with relatives nearby would probably not see many letters from Poland, since most of these letters are written by relatives; for children with no relatives nearby, letters would be
an important part of their contact with the written Polish language.

School, play groups, even talking with friends and relations or at Saturday School made up the lesser domains of usage. Home was where they usually spoke Polish. Of the 37 children interviewed, only three reported themselves as never speaking Polish to either parents, or siblings, or at prayer, or to adult family friends or fellow ethnic peers.

The answers children gave to the questions about their language usage, maintenance and environment can be summarised under two main headings. The first part consists of those responses which describe the children's actual practice, i.e. what language they spoke, when and to whom.

All 37 of these children learned to speak Polish as their first language, and although there are only three who never speak any at all now, it is clear that English is the dominant language they experience and use.

The situations described and the responses from the group of Polish children are shown in Table 4:6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child speaks Polish</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) To grandfather</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) To grandmother</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) To other relatives</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) To adult Polish family friends</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) To other Polish children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) To father</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) To mother</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) To siblings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) For prayers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that there is a great difference in the children's language practice according to the generation of the person to whom they are speaking. The column 'Never' shows the number of children always using English; half the children addressing their brothers and sisters and two thirds of those with fellow ethnic friends always did so in English. On the other hand only a tiny fraction of the children addressed Polish-speaking adults only in English.

This difference may be of significance in forecasting the future maintenance of Polish in the group, since one could predict that these children, their peers and siblings, will continue their current language practice as they grow older and become in turn parents, relatives and adult friends of children of Polish descent.

All 37 of these children learned to speak Polish as their first language, and although there are only three who never speak any at all now, it is clear that English is the dominant language they experience and use. The children are all educated in English, play nearly all the time with English speaking children (though these children may themselves be foreign born or of migrant parentage, and may also have English as a second language). Probably nearly all the children think most of the time in English; but the children's

---

1 This finding is similar to that found in the Language Resources Project 1956 reported by Fishman and Nahirny in Fishman 1966
answers to a question about this proved ambiguous. They found it difficult to analyse how they thought and many denied thinking in any language at all. Twenty-seven of them replied that they never thought in Polish even when speaking it. Many parents commented that the children translated from English when speaking Polish to them.

The prospects for the future maintenance of Polish language speaking among this group of children are not, therefore, certain. Nevertheless, one should note that 32 of the children stated that they wished their own children to keep Polish. This expression of Polish language loyalty cannot be construed as a positive indication of future practice; but there were some suggestions from older children in the families interviewed that the use of Polish may increase as the children grow older, and less dependent upon the opinion and practices of their peers.

**Linguistic environment of Polish children**

In contrast to that section of the children's answers which describes their 'active' language experience, this second part describes their 'passive' linguistic environment. This is made up of the language practice of other people to them, and their encounters with the written word. All the children in the group heard Polish spoken at home by family and friends. Most of the children had some
experience of written Polish, though few of them were themselves literate in the language. Letters in Polish came to every house—hold, although only 13 of the children received letters written in Polish to themselves alone.

The children's answers to questions relating to their linguistic environment are tabulated in Table 4:7.

**TABLE 4:7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polish children's linguistic background</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From grandfather</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From grandmother</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From other relatives</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From adult Polish family friends</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From father</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From mother</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From siblings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From church</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information about the reading of Polish books, letters and papers was obtained from other members of the family as well as the

---

The answer to this question was not in terms of direct speech by adults to the children; rather it was language used by such friends when visiting the family home. As the children heard it, it is part of their linguistic environment.
children themselves. A family who regularly read such books and papers can be considered as reinforcing the mother tongue background of the child, even if he does not read much himself. Conversely a family reading little or nothing in Polish, is not reinforcing the child's knowledge of its mother tongue, even if there is a lot of Polish spoken at home.

The occasions when the children heard Polish from their parents at home can be set out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Number of Children Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At meals</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing Poland and relatives there</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For instructions about chores</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When parents were talking Polish with friends</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When parents were cross</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When parents were pleased</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In Canberra the other media do not provide reinforcement of Polish and Dutch. There are no radio or television programmes in the Polish or Dutch languages available. Both Polish and Dutch language weekly newspapers are available as well as other national language magazines. For a description of the foreign language press in Australia see Gilson and Zubrzycki 1967.
TABLE 4:8

Children's experience with written Polish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'times.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unexpectedly high figure for reading books by the children themselves reflects the children who counted reading their Saturday School textbooks. Many of the mothers were also counted by the children as 'reading' recipe books. There is no indication of whether parents who 'never' read papers or books in Polish did read in English. Some parents clearly could read English and did so. Every Polish house visited had some Polish books, but some parents were probably not interested in reading in either language.

²One mother illiterate.

Children who scored five on the Active Usage Scale had to be using some Polish to several people in their immediate environment. Although there can be no hard and fast dividing point, division at the median corresponds with a realistic division of the children, between those whose Polish maintenance was average, and those whose maintenance and fluency was high. Those who scored
ACTIVE USAGE SCALE

To obtain some measure of comparison between the Dutch and Polish children the Active Usage Scale was constructed. The distribution of scores by the Polish children on this scale is shown in Table 4:9.

TABLE 4:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Active Usage Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 0 3 4 6 3 8 2 1 2 5 = 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross Classification

The median score of the Polish group of children was five on the Active Usage Scale score. In order to test the possible significance of the relationship between the scores and socio-demographic factors the scale was collapsed into two parts around the median.

Children who scored five on the Active Usage Scale had to be using some Polish to several people in their immediate environment. Although there can be no hard and fast dividing point, division at the median corresponds with a realistic division of the children, between those whose Polish maintenance was average, and those whose maintenance and fluency was high. Those who scored

---

1See Ch. II
less than five were not necessarily using very much Polish, although nearly all the children used some.

Linguistic background

A somewhat similar scale to the Active Usage Scale was computed which measures the linguistic background of the children. The distribution of the children's scores is shown in Table 4:10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic background of the Polish Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 1 3 6 7 10 4 6 0 = 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scale can be considered as giving a family score, but it should be noted that such a score relates only to the child. The family's language behaviour can be quite different with their other children. Amongst the Polish families, for example, more Polish was used with pre-school children by the mothers of children interviewed. In the Dutch group there seemed to be a tendency in the opposite direction i.e. mothers spoke more English to toddlers than to older children.

A significant relationship was found between the Active Usage Scale scores and the children's linguistic background. Such a relationship was found since nearly all parents preferred the children to speak Polish at home. However, the weight of this preference and the steps parents took...
could reasonably be expected, particularly since the children are still young enough to be strongly influenced by their parents' practice at home. However not all the families with a high score on the linguistic background scale had children with a high score on the Active Usage Scale; but children with a high Active Usage Score also had a high score for their linguistic background.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale score and sex of children

No relationship was found. Ten boys scored five or less and nine boys more. Nine girls scored five or less and nine scored more. Clearly in Canberra, it does not follow that girls learn and practice more of their mother tongue.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale score and length of residence in Australia by father

There was no significant relationship between length of residence of the family and the children's score, although of the nine families who had been less than ten years in Australia, only two had children with a score of less than five; on the other hand five families with high scoring children had been in the country for more than fifteen years.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale score and father's preference for language spoken in the home

No significant relationship was found since nearly all the parents preferred the children to speak Polish at home. However, the weight of this preference and the steps parents took
to realise it varied widely. Some parents were very strict and refused to answer their children if they were addressed in English, others compromised on rather mixed usage, or allowed the children to answer them in English. On the other hand there were two parents who preferred English in the home, and both these parents had very low scoring children.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale score and contact with relatives

There was no significant relationship between the children's scores and their contact with relatives. However, the children in touch with a wider family group than just parents and siblings obviously had increased opportunities to speak and hear their mother tongue, and in fact, of the fifteen children who were not in touch with relatives, ten scored less than five. There was little distinction in score between children who were in touch with relatives, probably because a number of these relatives were cousins, or uncles and aunts, who often spoke English.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale score and father's level of education

A high level of education amongst parents could be expected to influence their children's scores and attitudes to language maintenance. However, such influence is not always in the same direction. If families wish to maintain a language at home in the face of a different dominant language in the society at large, the parents intellectual resources and attainments will be of assistance. If the family did not wish to keep mother tongue
such intellectual resources should make it easier for the parents to learn the language of the host society themselves, and to help their children acquire proficiency in the new language.

Because of the strong national tradition of language and cultural maintenance in the face of repression, it was predicted that favourable attitudes towards language maintenance would be found amongst families of Polish intellectuals in Canberra.

The relationship between the score of the children and the education level of the parents was found to be significant.

It is interesting that of the seven fathers who had some tertiary education, none had children who scored less than three, and of the 20 fathers who had completed primary education or less, 13 had children who scored less than five, and eight of these scored less than three.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale score and father's employment

Although education and occupation are not always matched amongst migrant groups, particularly where professional qualifications are not recognised, in this survey they are closely related.

Amongst the Polish families the father's occupations were distributed in very much the same way as their education levels.

The relationship between father's occupation and children's score is significant.
It was thought that there might be some relationship between membership of an ethnic organisation and regular attendance there, and a high degree of language maintenance at home. In this survey such a relationship was not found to be significant. This is probably because most of the families in the group belong to the Polish club for social, rather than cultural reasons, and even regular attendance by the fathers need imply no more than a desire to drink with fellow ethnic companions.

No significant relationship was found between children's attendance at the Polish club and their scores. This was an unexpected result which could perhaps be attributed to the number of children attending Saturday School because their parents wanted them to maintain Polish, despite (or because of) the children's lack of fluency or practice in the language. Some families with a high level of language loyalty and practice were unable to attend because of transport difficulties.

It was considered by the author that there might be some relationship between maintenance of bilingualism in the family and the parents' fluency and familiarity with languages other than
Polish and English. It might be predicted that parents familiar with several languages would value this accomplishment, and would consider bilingualism in their early years helpful to their children. Such a reason was mentioned by some parents in the Polish group as one of the values of bilingualism for the children, but no significant relationship was found between the number of languages spoken by father and the children's score. One very likely reason for this is the fact that most of the parents were of school age when they arrived in Australia; a large majority of parents could speak German and Russian, the two most common languages quoted.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale score and size of family and child's position in it

The author considered that both size of family and the child's position in it might affect both the child's practice and fluency in mother tongue, and also his attitude towards speaking Polish or Dutch at home. It was surmised that eldest children might be more inclined to speak their mother tongue, since they would probably have had more practice in doing so when very young, and having their parents to themselves. The author thought that youngest children, and those who were middling or younger members of large families might give up their ethnic tongue more readily.
since their siblings would presumably start speaking English as soon as they started school. Amongst the Polish and Dutch children, being a member of a large family had effects on the children's attitude and practice, but such effects could work both ways. Among the Dutch group in particular, where some large families with several children arrived in Australia with adolescent or young adults, the younger children probably heard a lot of Dutch spoken at home. However, if these young adults married and moved away from home, or if the eldest children were of school age when they arrived in Australia, a large family became an English speaking environment more quickly than did a small one. Once the children became fluent in English at school they usually spoke English to their siblings. A number of parents commented that children who came to Australia after they were twelve had great difficulty in learning enough English to keep up good progress at school, but the younger children seemed to have had little trouble.

In fact no relationship was found between the size of the family and the scores of the children, but it is interesting that nine youngest and three eldest children scored five or less and only six youngest and seven eldest children scored more than five.

1Fishman and Nahirny in Fishman 1966 - in this study a survey of the children of leaders of four ethnic communities by the authors found that youngest children used significantly more English than did the eldest children in families.
The author at first considered that most of the children would know nursery rhymes in Polish or Dutch, since presumably adults would be unfamiliar with these in English. This turned out not to be so, since if the children had ever known nursery rhymes in their mother tongue they certainly did not know them by the time they were in sixth grade. In fact, they all knew English nursery rhymes from having learned them at school, or in one case, from an elder sister who was a baby-sitter for her neighbours' Australian children and learned rhymes from them which she taught her own brothers and sister.
### TABLE 4:11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of children</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p)0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic background</td>
<td>6.431</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p)0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence in Australia by father</td>
<td>2.646</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p)0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference by father for language spoken at home</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p)0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with grandparents and other relatives</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p)0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's level of education</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p)0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p)0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's ethnic club attendance</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p)0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Saturday School attendance</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p)0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken by father other than Polish and English</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p)0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the socio-linguistic data for Dutch parents and children. As in Chapter Four there are three parts; the first dealing with parents' attitudes to the maintenance of Dutch and the value of bilingualism in general. The second part records the children’s language behaviour within the six specific domains of usage in their roles as speakers and hearers of their mother tongue. There is also a description of their attitudes to bilingualism and language maintenance. The third part shows the relationship between the children’s language behaviour measured on the Active Usage Scale and some socio-demographic factors.

LANGUAGE BEHAVIOUR AND ATTITUDES

Language spoken by parents

Many Dutch parents spoke languages other than Dutch and English; the number of languages spoken by them is recorded in Table 5:1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of languages</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appeared to the author that Dutch is a language allowing quite little latitude in pronunciation compared with Polish. Yet the author attempted to pronounce a Polish word, although it was said quite correctly, most of the Polish-speaking children understood it. However, amongst the Dutch-speaking children, the author was frequently not understood and a parent had to be asked to help.

TABLE 5:1

Languages spoken by Dutch parents other than Dutch and English
The value of bilingualism

All but one of the parents thought it useful to have two or more languages; the reasons that they gave fall under the same headings as those given by Polish parents. There did not appear to be any significant differences between mothers and fathers and the reasons given ranged as follows:

| (i) Cultural | 13 |
| (ii) Economic | 8 |
| (iii) Travel | 9 |
| (iv) Communication | 24 |

TABLE 5:2

Parents' reasons for value of bilingualism

Thirty-six fathers and 32 mothers had learnt English either at school or at special classes before migrating to Australia. Seventeen fathers and 20 mothers had attended classes after arriving here. None of the Dutch adults interviewed appeared to have any difficulty understanding the author, but the author did have trouble understanding two or three of the parents. As a group, however, the Dutch are not only competent, but justifiably proud of their ability in English.

It appeared to the author that Dutch is a language allowing little latitude in pronunciation compared with Polish. If the author attempted to pronounce a Polish word, although it was said quite incorrectly, most of the Polish speaking children understood; however, amongst the Dutch speaking children the author was frequently not understood and a parent had to be asked to help.
Preference for language spoken in the home

The answers to questions about language preferred at home, about helping children keep up Dutch, and about preference for grandchildren speaking Dutch followed a very different pattern from the Polish group. From the 49 couples for whom answers were available, only six couples preferred Dutch spoken at home and all these parents helped their children keep up Dutch. Only four of them, however, wanted their grandchildren to speak Dutch; one couple preferred that they should speak English and one other couple didn't know what language they preferred for their grandchildren; (there were two cases where one parent wanted Dutch and one wanted English). Amongst these families, only one couple did not help their children with Dutch, and the two mothers who would have preferred English at home did not help their children, although the fathers did.

Among these ten couples, however, only one couple wanted their grandchildren to speak English, three couples preferred Dutch and six couples said they did not know. There were two families who specified that they did not mind what language was spoken at home, both families wanted the grandchildren to speak Dutch, in one family both parents helped the children keep some Dutch and in the other family the mother helped, although the father did not. Thirty-one couples stated that they preferred English to be spoken at home, although in these 31 families there were eleven who said that they would help the children
with Dutch if they were asked. Only 14 of the 31 wanted their grandchildren to speak English and six couples stated that they would like their grandchildren to speak Dutch. Eleven couples did not know what they wanted for their grandchildren.

Overall, only six couples preferred Dutch at home and 31 preferred English at home, 15 couples wanted their grandchildren to speak Dutch (several families qualified this, saying that they realised it was not likely to happen). Only 16 families wanted their grandchildren to speak English and 18 answered 'don't know'; one might speculate that the parents who stated that they preferred English at home were perhaps giving an answer they thought pleasing to the interviewer; or possibly that they were being realistic about their children's actual performance at home. Either way one could surmise that the 33 'don't know' and 'prefer Dutch' reflect a closer attachment to their mother tongue than might appear from their answers.

Parents' language choice with family and friends

In 31 families the parents reported that they sometimes spoke

---

1 The mother whose husband had left her sometime before stated that when she meets her husband now they continue to speak English. They decided to do this soon after their arrival in Australia on the advice of their eldest child's teacher. The child was failing in English and the teacher suggested that she would improve if the parents always used English at home. The mother reported that after they did this the child's difficulties were eased.
Dutch to each other; in 14 the parents reported that they always used Dutch. Four couples said that they never spoke to each other in Dutch. As with the Poles, the Dutch were meticulously careful about not speaking Dutch to each other in front of Australians.

CHILDREN'S LANGUAGE BEHAVIOUR AND ATTITUDES

Language used with peers

Like the Polish children, some of the Dutch children found it both useful and fun to use their mother tongue for secrets. Seven reported that they sometimes spoke Dutch with friends, but the other 43 said that they always spoke English to their friends.

Language used when attending ethnic organisations

There was no ethnic organisation available specifically for Dutch children in Canberra. Five children reported that they had attended functions at the Dutch Club with their parents. At these functions they heard Dutch spoken, but themselves spoke mostly English.

Language used and heard in religious domain

Of the 17 children who said that they attended church only one reported sometimes hearing the service in Dutch. In Canberra mass was said in Dutch once a month for Catholics, but in the Protestant churches, to which the other children belonged, the services
were always in English. Sixteen Dutch children reported that they never said any prayers, three children used some Dutch when saying their prayers, but none used only Dutch; the remaining 31 said their prayers in English.

**Language spoken with relatives**

Two families were shortly taking their children to Holland for a visit to grandparents, and in one family the grandparents had arrived from Holland to stay a week before the author's interview. Several other grandmothers had visited during the past few years. The parents regarded these visits as an important reason for maintaining Dutch language speaking by their children.

**Children's attitude to being bilingual and language maintenance**

In keeping with their parents' attitudes to the maintenance of Dutch in Australia, the Dutch children seemed much less emotionally involved with language maintenance than were Polish children. Thirty-six children affirmed that they would study Dutch at high school if it were possible (17 of these spoke little or no Dutch). Neither Dutch nor Polish was available for school study in Canberra at this time.

Like the Polish children most (47) of the Dutch children thought it useful to speak or know two languages. Thirty-nine thought they would like their own children to be bilingual. The
reasons they gave, divided under the same headings as those for the Polish children are contained in Table 5:3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>For self</th>
<th>For own children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Cultural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Economic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Travel</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Talking to others</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Talking to family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Secrets</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, like the Polish children many Dutch children said that it would be easier if their own children could know some Dutch in order to communicate with grandparents.

There is one noticeable difference between the two groups of children. Few Dutch children gave preservation of the historical links or family connections with Holland as a reason for wanting their own children to be bilingual. Another difference was in the matter of which languages they wanted their children to speak. Among the Poles three children said English and German, two said Polish and French, and two were not sure. The rest wanted Polish and English. Among the Dutch children five thought English and German, five English and French, two Dutch and either French or German and three English and 'something useful'. Thus of the 39 children wanting their offspring to be bilingual 15 did not choose the languages they themselves
were familiar with. Little trend amongst older siblings to improve
their Dutch in later years, even though several of them looked forward
to trips to Europe in the near future. One older sister had worked
in Hol... Thirty-six of the group preferred English, seven said they
liked both languages and seven preferred Dutch. The reasons for
preferring English resembled the Polish group: thirty-one children
found English easier; three preferred English as useful; seven
because 'everyone uses it'; one child found English prettier. Of
the children preferring Dutch or both languages, seven did so
because they found Dutch interesting; one found Dutch prettier;
three found Dutch easier, and four liked Dutch because the family
they were conscious that their children did not want them to sound
spoke it.

Many Dutch parents spontaneously told the author that they felt
it was important that they speak English to their children in
front of Australians, another adults or children. Many parents said
three found Dutch easier, and four liked Dutch because the family
foreign. Many parents also spontaneously mentioned the difficulties
of dealing with Australians in English learned from natives of the
U.K. (e.g. a pail is not used in Australia, only a bucket). Only
one of the children thought that Australians were annoyed if they
spoke Dutch in front of them, but a further nine thought Australians
were curious. Very few of the children ever spoke Dutch outside
their homes, and none had any experience of teachers forbidding them
to speak Dutch.

Language used at home

Like the Polish group all the Dutch children heard some Dutch
at home, although three reported that family friends never spoke
Dutch in their house. The children's usage pattern is shown in
There seemed little trend amongst older siblings to improve their Dutch in later years, even though several of them looked forward to trips to Europe in the near future. One older sister had worked in Holland for two years as a shorthand typist, but was not keeping up her Dutch now that she was back in Australia again. The comment was very often made that all business people in Holland spoke English, so that there was little commercial advantage in retaining Dutch.

Many Dutch parents spontaneously told the author that they felt it was important that they should speak English to their children in front of Australians, whether adults or children. Many parents said they were conscious that their children did not want them to sound foreign. Many parents also spontaneously mentioned the difficulties of dealing with Australians in English learned from natives of the U.K. (e.g. a pail is not used in Australia, only a bucket). Only one of the children thought that Australians were annoyed if they spoke Dutch in front of them, but a further nine thought Australians were curious. Very few of the children ever spoke Dutch outside their homes, and none had any experience of teachers forbidding them to speak Dutch.

Language used at home

Like the Polish group all the Dutch children heard some Dutch at home, although three reported that family friends never spoke Dutch in their house. The children's usage pattern is shown in
Table 5:4. Table 5:5 demonstrates the linguistic background of the Dutch children.

**TABLE 5:4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child speaks Dutch</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) To grandfather</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) To grandmother</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) To other relatives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) To adult Dutch family friends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) To other Dutch children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) To father</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) To mother</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) To siblings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) For prayers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus half the children reported not using Dutch to the people, and on the occasions, enquired about by the author.

**TABLE 5:5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The children hear Dutch</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) From grandfather</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) From grandmother</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) From other relatives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) From adult Dutch family friends</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) From father</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) From mother</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) From siblings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) At church</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers are of children times the behaviour by one or both parents at home can be set out as follows...
The occasions when the children heard Dutch from their parents at home can be set out as follows:

(The numbers are of children reporting such behaviour by one or both parents.)

At meals 26
Discussing Holland and relatives there 26
For instructions about chores e.g. peel the potatoes 29
When parents were talking Dutch with friends 25
When parents were cross 41
When parents were pleased 17

The children discussed homework in English; unlike the Polish children several of them commented that Dutch was spoken sometimes 'for fun'; adults were amused to hear them.

Children's contact with literature and correspondence

Like the Polish children most of the Dutch children had some experience with written Dutch. The children's experience with written Dutch is tabulated in Table 5:6.

**TABLE 5:6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sibs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nev.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Letters received

Parents  50
Children  18

ACTIVE USAGE SCORE

Like the Polish children, most of the Dutch children in the group surveyed learnt their first words in Dutch, but only half of them now use any at home. The distribution of Dutch children along the scale for active usage is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5:7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of children on the Active Usage Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 5 5 5 4 3 1 1 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution is in great contrast with that of Polish children on this scale\(^1\). Only ten Dutch children scored more than three and only three had a higher score than five; whereas 27 Polish children scored higher than three, between seven and ten.

Cross Classification

It should be noticed that a score of nought means that a child has answered 'no' when asked whether he speaks Dutch to his mother, father, siblings, adult friends of the family or friends of Dutch parentage. It is possible, however, for a child to be quite fluent

---

\(^1\) See Chapter IV
in Dutch and still answer 'no' to all these questions, and there was one such child in the survey\(^1\). The active usage score only reflects the children's answers to the author's questions about current language behaviour. However, these are such central areas of use that if a child is not speaking in Dutch in any of them, when it could do so, it is likely that this is due to a negative attitude towards using Dutch in the Australian situation.

Of the 25 Dutch children not speaking any Dutch eight did not understand much of it either. The rest varied considerably in their exposure to Dutch and their comprehension of it, as judged both by their families' reports to the author, and by their scores on the word test (question 34.).\(^2\) Four of the children understood no Dutch at all; a further four did not understand any of the Dutch words in the test. However, seven of the children understood all the Dutch words and a further three made a fairly accurate guess at the third word, getting the other two correct. These ten children all heard Dutch at home and understood it well in its domestic version; none of them ever spoke it on the occasions surveyed.

**Cross Classification**

The median score on the Active Usage Scale for the Dutch children fell between nought and one. The group was, therefore,

\(^1\) see footnote p.106

\(^2\) see p.108
divided at this point and tests of significance were made using the Chi Square Test. It should be noted that this means the Dutch children are divided between those who spoke no Dutch at all and those who spoke any, no matter how much or little.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale Score to sex of children

There was no relationship found between these two variables.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale Score to linguistic background

The distribution of 'family scores' on the scale derived from the child's linguistic background is shown in Table 5:8.

TABLE 5:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic background score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the Polish group, there is a close relationship between the language behaviour of the family as represented by these scores, and the Active Usage Scale Score of the children; the variables represented by these two scores are significantly related.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale Score to length of father's residence in Australia

A significant relationship was found between these two variables.

1 See Chapter IV
Long residence leads to less Dutch speaking. However, two of the three children who scored more than five, came from families which had been in Australia more than 16 years. In one family the children had, in fact, spoken very little Dutch until their recent visit to Holland, and although they had been returned about a year they were enjoying keeping the language up in the expectation of further visits. The child with the highest score was born in Australia, but she was the last child of twelve, and many of the older children were in their twenties when they arrived in Australia. As it happened few of the children had married and left home, so that there were a large number of Dutch speaking adults constantly at home.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale Score to preference for language spoken in the home

The relationship between the children's score and father's preference for language that children should speak in the home is highly significant; this result is only to be expected, particularly with children as young as this conformity to parents' wishes is still predictable.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale Score to contact with relatives

There appears to be no relationship between the children's score and their contact with relatives. This is understandable, since many relatives, and even some grandparents, spoke English to the children. Nevertheless, there were some children whose most important contact with the Dutch language was through hearing, and
speaking, to their grandparents.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale Score to father's level of education

There is not here the same relationship between education and score that is found amongst the Polish children. The child who spoke most Dutch had a father who had only completed primary school. The

---

1 In one particular case in the survey this led to an interesting anomaly in a child's score on the Active Usage Scale Score; this child's family had recently returned to Australia after a year in Holland, during which time the child had attended school, used Dutch with all members of the family, and although finding some of the written work difficult, had been generally competent at school and fluent in Dutch. This child still can speak Dutch, think in Dutch, and comprehends well. However, in Australia, the child never speaks Dutch; the parents in the family are fluent in several languages, but speak and prefer English at home. The child reports preferring the use of English in Australia since 'everybody else speaks it here'. Such a statement may be intelligent realism, or an emotional rejection of Dutch, or a need to be accepted as only English speaking; there is no evidence to suggest which explanation, if any, is correct. However, the low score does reflect the child's actual language behaviour, even though it is no indication of the extent or depth of the child's bilingual competence and experience.
two families where the fathers held university degrees had children who spoke very little Dutch, although these children understood it well.\footnote{In one of these families the parents had themselves come to Australia as teenage members of a Dutch Reform community. They attended university in Australia, and when their first child was born decided that they would try and keep both Dutch and English in the home. They spoke Dutch to her and she learnt English at a local pre-school. The parents were very happy with her progress until she went to the local school at five; they were then concerned to find that her English grammar and accent started to deteriorate, and as they saw their future in Australia, they felt it important that this should not continue. They could think of no other way of insuring that her English would be corrected, so they started to speak English at home, and have continued to do this with their younger children. Although the family is not now near close relatives the children still visit their grandparents and still understand Dutch, but except for the two eldest they do not commit themselves to speaking it.}

The situation in one of the families whose head held an academic position has already been described. Their child could speak Dutch, but preferred to use English in Australia and the parents concurred.

Neither the education nor the occupation of the parents in these families was related to the children's ability to speak Dutch.
Relationship of Active Usage Scale Score to father's occupation

No relationship exists between the occupation of the Dutch fathers and the language usage of their children. The lack of relationship is in strong contrast to the situation with the Polish group of families, and is itself a notable feature of the survey. Neither the education nor the occupation of the parents in these families was related to the children's ability to speak Dutch. This fact in turn appears to reflect the wider Dutch community attitude to Dutch language maintenance in Canberra.

Relationship of Active Usage Scale Score to ethnic club attendance by parents

There were only four families where either parent reported being a member who attended the Dutch Club regularly, and in these four families two children scored nought, one child scored two and one seven. There were ten families who were members and occasionally attended the Club, and in seven of these families the children scored nought; the other three, one child scored two, one children three and the other child scored four.

As far as the author knows, there has never been any suggestion that the club should play any role in encouraging the maintenance of Dutch language and culture amongst families of Dutch descent in Canberra. It does have a social and welfare role, but only a small percentage of parents in the survey were affiliated with it. By comparison, amongst Polish families a desire to keep up
Polish cultural traditions and to educate their children in their heritage was usually associated with membership of the 'White Eagle Club'. Some parents who did desire to keep their links with their former homeland had particular personal reasons for their non-membership or non-attendance of that club, but on the whole, an interest in the maintenance of language and culture was both responsible for families membership of the club, and was reinforced by their attendance at its social and educational functions.

Since the Dutch Club did not aspire to the same educational role, even families who wished to maintain Dutch traditions and speaking in their homes did not necessarily feel that membership of the Club was relevant to their aim.
THE RELATIONSHIP OF DUTCH CHILDREN’S SCORE ON

THE ACTIVE USAGE SCALE TO OTHER VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of children</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p&gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic background</td>
<td>16.428</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence by Australia by father</td>
<td>6.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference by father for language spoken in home</td>
<td>6.278</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with grandparents and other relatives</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>p&gt;.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's level of education</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p&gt;.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p&gt;.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the scores of the Polish children with those of the Dutch children on the Active Usage Scale was made. The Chi Square Test was applied with the following results:

Differences between Dutch group and Polish group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.727</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01$p$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Active Usage Scale is an effective instrument in distinguishing the difference in score distribution of the Polish and Dutch children on this scale of some negligible. Such measurements however are only an abstraction of simplified measurable aspects of very complex behavior in a total social context. It would be un rewarding to mistake the score for the child. Moreover, the total number of children in each group was different, varying from 64 to 70. The same survey with larger group of children at different ages could well show major differences in distribution. It does not quantify the actual amount of language choice by the children in various situations, and it does not measure the amount of usage, derived from a sense of language behavior. Given the difficulty the children had in analyzing their choices:
This chapter draws together the material of the preceding three chapters, with a summary of the findings which seem most relevant to the aims of the study.

With some shortcomings, inseparable from the use of self-report questionnaires, the methods used proved satisfactory. The Active Usage Scale was an effective instrument both in distinguishing language behaviour at the individual level, and in differentiating the two groups of children. The difference in score distribution was of the Polish and Dutch children on this scale of some magnitude. Such measurements however are only an abstraction of simplified measurable aspects of very complex behaviour in a total social context. It would be unrewarding to mistake the score for the child. Moreover, the total number of children in both groups was not large; similar surveys with larger groups, and possibly at different ages could well show major differences in distribution.

The Active Usage Scale is in effect an index of language choice by the children in various situations, and somewhat of the amount of usage, derived from a census of language behaviour. It does not quantify the actual amount of their mother tongue the children were speaking in, say, a day, (nor would this be possible given the difficulty the children had in analysing their choices.)
Thus a child who spoke the mother tongue 'always' to his family but spent most of his time playing with Australian friends, is scored the same, though clearly having a different language usage pattern, as the child who also 'always' speaks mother tongue to his family and seldom sees anyone else. In fact the basic underlying assumption of the scale that the children would have similar day-to-day behaviour, appeared to be justified with these two groups; conceivably however such behaviour could vary.

Since the score depends upon the number of people with whom the child speaks his mother tongue, and since relatives were excluded from the responses used in this count, there could be some children whose score is artificially low. Originally grandparents and relatives were counted for the child's usage, but the difficulties of standardising scores where children were not in touch with relatives, led to their eventual exclusion altogether. This had little effect on the relative position of Polish children on the scale, but it did have the effect of removing five children who spoke Dutch only to relatives, to the category scoring zero.

\footnote{There were two Polish families whose children played together in Polish and these used less English during the day than most of their compatriots.}

\footnote{This was also reported by Fishman and Mahoney in Fishman 1964, p. 185.}
Elaboration of the question about contact with relatives might remove some anomalies, but the problems of children not in touch with relatives would remain.

Some problems with the wording of the questionnaire have been noted previously (Chapter Two), as have problems associated with judging the reliability of attitude expression. Also there was little opportunity to relate such expression to actual behaviour. The children's expression of their attitudes was not spontaneous and in some cases had indeed been rehearsed. As the survey progressed the children came to know from other friends what was in the questionnaire; it was clear that adults and children had frequently discussed attitudes to language maintenance before the author arrived. Although so many children expressed a preference for English, no child expressed an unfavourable attitude to Polish. But some Polish children were more extreme in their expressions of positive identification than were their parents; in several instances children told the author they enjoyed Saturday School attendance, while parents later denied this!

A more spontaneous expression of attitude might be obtained if questionnaires were administered to children at school, but in this case much valuable information from the parents would be lost.}

1 This was also reported by Fishman and Nahirny in Fishman 1966 p. 185.
While there is certainly a need for the kind of information which can be gained from a large-scale census, the complexity of language behaviour and its context ensures that the face-to-face small group study will remain advantageous. This study would have been aided by the addition of a proper objective measure of the children's competence in their mother tongue, although such a measure would need to be developed by a linguist. No such tests are known to the author.

It would also be valuable to have some measure of the children's general academic intelligence, since this must affect their ability to master two languages. Similarly, a test of language aptitude would be helpful; several parents commented on the different aptitudes for language learning which existed among children in their own families.

A general summary of the findings of this survey follow for the Polish group. The Polish children were evenly distributed on the Active Usage Scale. All understood some Polish and 34 of them could speak at least a little. These results are very similar to those of Johnston. However, a different picture

In her survey of Polish families in Western Australia Johnston enquired into the amount of Polish used at home among 60 metropolitan families and 42 country families. In the metropolitan group no family spoke English only, two spoke More English than Polish, 11 half and half, 10 More Polish than English and 37 only Polish. No distinction was made between family roles as speakers and hearers.
emerges if one considers the generation of those to whom the children are speaking. Most speak some Polish to adults and very few speak Polish to children of their own age, either siblings or friends.

The intergenerational difference in the speaking of national language is also noted by Fishman and Nahirny who found in the study already referred to that amongst four groups of children whose parents were ethnic organisation leaders (Polish, Ukrainian, Jewish and German) all the children spoke markedly less mother tongue to their siblings than to their grandparents. Fishman and Nahirny found that English became the functional mother tongue of the third generation of migrants, while the ancestral language became a 'grandmother tongue' (discussed later in this chapter).

The relationship of the children's scores with the socio-demographic factors was varied, and unexpected. Significant relationships were found between high scores and a high educational and occupational level of the children's fathers. There was also a significant relationship between the amount of Polish spoken to the children and the amount that they used.

Factors which were not significantly related to the scores were: sex of the child, size of family and child's position in it. 

1 In Fishman 1966 pp. 161-182.
attendance at Saturday School, parents' migration history and
length of residence and parents' membership of ethnic organisations.
The children spoke and heard most Polish in the family
domain. Most of them had considerable experience of Polish in a
religious setting, and nearly all of them with their parents
reading and writing Polish, even if the children could not read
Polish books and letters themselves.

The lack of relationship between so many variables, which
it was assumed might have some association, or possible explanatory
relation, with the amount of Polish spoken by the children, was
itself a significant finding. Moreover it was clear from the
reports and from the interviews, that usage was not necessarily
related to an interest in language maintenance as such.

As with so many other studies of the acculturation behaviour
of migrants\(^1\) one most useful way to look at the data is to make
a typology.

In the Polish group studies there appear to be two types
of family. The types were distinguished by the author subject-
ively, but some indications of their existence also appear in the
statistical data. The first type had educated fathers, usually

\(^1\) e.g. Eisenstadt, Martin, Johnston, Taft.
with professional or managerial jobs who expressed a strong ideological commitment to the maintenance of Polish culture and language at home. There were eleven families of this kind, and all had been in Australia for more than ten years; three of the fathers were holding jobs of lower prestige, but had lost status by their immigration to Australia; two were formerly teachers in Poland, and one a university student. Not all the children in this group scored highly on the Active Usage Scale, but the range of scores was from four to ten.

A second type was found in 25 families whose heads were less educated, who held jobs of lower prestige, and who expressed less ideological commitment to Polish; their maintenance of Polish speaking is related to the length of time they had been in Australia. Those who had been here for less than ten years used Polish extensively in the home because the parents found it more comfortable and the children were still sufficiently practiced to feel little sense of strain in speaking Polish. In families of longer residence, the children used less Polish and although the parents still spoke it with each other and their friends, and sometimes to their older children, they usually spoke to the younger children in English. Most of the parents said they preferred Polish at home, but they did not attach great importance to its retention. The children in these families scored between zero and six. Three families who were recent arrivals had children with scores of ten and fathers of low education and occupational status. Two of these
families lived nearby, and the children played together; there were also babies in the families and these children spoke Polish more often than they did English. In the other family there was a high degree of involvement in ethnic organisations, and both parents expressed a strong commitment to Polish cultural maintenance. Although the father's education was only to the primary level, the mother in this family had a secondary education.

The author deliberately did not explore possible areas of tension between parents and children about language maintenance. Johnston's findings in her study of the assimilation of Polish migrants in Western Australia showed that nearly all Polish parents were in favour of Polish language maintenance, and that this could be an area of conflict if the children were not oriented to the parents' ethnic culture. The discrepancies in this study between the children's expression of their attitudes to Polish culture and their preference for English suggest that there may have been tension in these families also.

There are demographic differences between the Dutch and Polish groups studied, but these do not appear to bear any relationship to the differences found in their national language maintenance. Some of the Poles were refugee migrants who had been unwilling to return to their own country in the early years after the Second World War, but other Polish families had come to Australia since 1957, usually to join relatives already settled here, and their
reasons for emigration must be considered to be mostly economic. There were no major differences between Dutch and Polish migrants in their dates of arrival, although nearly all the Dutch came directly from Holland, and many Poles came via camps in Germany. There were no major differences in the age range of the parents or in the numbers naturalised. There were rather more Polish parents (12) uncertain about spending their lives in Australia than Dutch (8), but not a great difference between the groups in their apparent satisfaction with Australia.

Marked differences are found however between the two groups in the levels of education of the fathers. Only 17 out of 37 Polish fathers had some secondary education, and only five had trade qualifications, but 43 of the Dutch fathers had secondary education and 25 had trade qualifications. Only six out of 50 Dutch fathers had some tertiary education, and only two had university degrees, while seven Polish fathers had some tertiary education and three had completed degrees.

There is a similar disparity between the groups in the occupation of the fathers. Only five of the Dutch fathers were in the category of unskilled labourers, while 18 of the Polish fathers were in this category. Twenty-three of the Dutch fathers were in the category of skilled craftsmen, while only three of the Polish fathers were in this category. More Dutch fathers owned their own businesses, but there were rather more Poles in
professional and clerical occupations than there were Dutch.

Although father's education above secondary level (and high occupational status) was related to high scores among some Polish children, no such relationship was found with the Dutch group. There were differences between the groups in the size of their families, 23 Dutch families having five or more children, but only nine Polish families being in this category. Size of family was associated with high scores in two Dutch and one Polish family; in other families it was related to particularly low scores.

In the area of ethnic club affiliation and attendance there are also marked differences between the Polish and Dutch families and the children. Only nine Polish fathers never went to the club, whereas only four of the Dutch fathers attended their club regularly and membership was confined to twelve couples in all. There is no Saturday School where children can study Dutch language and culture, but amongst the Polish children 25 of them had at one time attended Saturday School. Although ethnic club attendance by the parents was not significantly associated with language use or maintenance, the existence of the Polish Saturday School, and

\[1\] Both in family size and in the occupational structure of the group, the Dutch families in Canberra resemble those described in Queensland by Hempel.
the lack of any similar Dutch school, can be taken as an expression of the respective community's attitudes towards the importance of language maintenance. The low level of membership, and of club attendance, among Dutch parents may reflect a dissociation from their ethnic past which may in turn be related to their encouragement of English speaking by their children; such an association might be made tentatively about this particular group, but it should be noted that all but two of the Dutch couples had Dutch friends whom they saw regularly. Zubrzycki found that the Dutch in the Latrobe Valley also had few national organisations; but despite a high level of contact with Australians, and participation in community affairs, they still were closely in touch with fellow ethnic friends.

All the Polish families were Roman Catholic and all but three families attended church, most of them to hear mass in Polish. Nineteen Dutch families were Roman Catholic, the rest were of other Protestant denominations. Only 17 children in the Dutch group attended church, and only one had ever attended a Dutch service in Australia. There was no evidence of a relationship between religion and language maintenance, although amongst the Polish families attendance at Polish services was part of their general commitment to the maintenance of their Polish heritage. The Dutch Catholics, however, did not show any reinforcement of Dutch speaking and all but one regularly attended services in English.

There were few differences between the two groups in the parents' language choice with each other and their fellow ethnic
friends. All the families in both groups had fellow ethnic friends, but four Dutch couples spoke English to each other and three to their friends; all the Polish parents used Polish to each other and their friends.

There was some difference between the two groups in their preference for language they wanted their children to speak at home, most Dutch preferring English, while very few Poles did so. No Polish parents spoke to their children only in English, but there were a few Dutch parents who did so, and most Dutch parents used some English with the children. There was a relationship for the Dutch between parental preference and children's behaviour, but not for the Poles.

The distribution of Dutch children's scores on the Active Usage Scale is very different from that of the Polish children, since 25 children scored zero. Nevertheless, most Dutch children understood some Dutch, and over half of them still speak some Dutch to some members of their families. However, only three of them scored more than five, which was the median score for Polish children. Home was the area where most Dutch was used and heard, but only three children ever spoke it to their siblings and in two cases these were babies. Six children said they used Dutch with their friends, but this was often an occasional phrase for 'secrets'. In the Dutch group there was a significant relationship between the low scores of the children and the parents' preference for English at home, there was also a significant relationship between children's
usage and the amount of Dutch they heard in the home, and a significant relationship between the amount of time the family had been in Australia and the score of the children. There is a lineal decline of Dutch speaking with the length of residence. These findings are similar to those of Mol\textsuperscript{1}. The decline is emphasised by the apparent exception of the high scoring children whose families had been resident for 20 years. These children had the highest scores of the whole group; two had spent time in Holland in the previous year, and the other came from a family with an unusual number of Dutch speaking adults at home. However, visiting Holland did not have an inevitable effect of increasing Dutch speaking, since one child who had spent the previous year in Holland spoke little or none when in Australia.

Reference has been made to the ethnic mother tongue as a 'grandmother' tongue. Fishman and Nahinry found that their ancestral tongue became a 'grandmother' tongue in the third generation migrant children; in this study there was a striking illustration of such a process in the second generation. Because Next Dutch parents expressed a sentimental attachment to their language and took pragmatic attitudes by their children. However, there is no evidence of this necessarily categorised as using no Dutch, who did in fact speak Dutch

\textsuperscript{1}Only 29\% of Dutch migrants in New Zealand spoke more Dutch than English at home after ten years residence. Mol 1965 p.14.
with their grandparents, and only with them, and twelve children
with zero scores heard Dutch from grandparents. Moreover, of
the 25 children who were scored as Dutch speaking, twelve also
spoke with grandparents. In fact grandparents were an important
domain of Dutch language use for the children, just as school
friends and play was an English use domain.

There was little sign of conflict between parents and
children over language behaviour in the Dutch group. Both
Dutch and Polish parents were sensitive to the possibilities of
hostility from the Australian community and were careful to use
English with their children in public. The Dutch parents, as a
group, seemed more concerned about children's school difficulties,
since they felt that the likeness of the two languages led to
problems for the children. They were concerned too that the
children's English should be good. No Polish families expressed
themselves as worried about their children's English standards,
but no questions were asked in this area.

Most Dutch parents expressed a sentimental attachment to
their language, but took a pragmatic attitude to its loss by their
children. However, there is no evidence that this is necessarily
a national trait; Zubrzycki's Latrobe Valley findings suggest
that among some Dutch Calvinist groups Dutch speaking will be
reinforced when associated with group aims such as club membership.
Restrictions on the breadth and depth of this study limit the possibility of generalising widely from the findings. The area of research was limited to examining the national language use and maintenance among pre-adolescent children of two groups of northern European migrants in a somewhat atypical Australian setting. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the findings may have a wider generality than pertains to this specific setting.

It was expected that the groups would display different attitudes and practice with respect to the maintenance of the children's mother tongue, and this finding was confirmed in the expected direction: most Polish parents encouraged national language maintenance, while most Dutch parents were neutral or discouraging towards national language maintenance by their children. Some association of various demographic factors with different degrees of language maintenance is demonstrated for both groups, but not in an explanatory relationship, since factors significantly associated with maintenance in one group are not found to be so with the other. These differing patterns point to no simple conclusion about language behaviour or attitudes to future maintenance.
Further studies of different national groups would no doubt produce other patterns of behaviour along with a continuum of language shift and maintenance, upon which these Dutch and Polish groups represent contrasting points. Other migrant groups do expend considerable effort in making it possible for their children to receive instruction in their mother tongue (e.g. Germans and Greeks in Melbourne); such studies would help to show whether membership of a particular migrant group is relevant as a determinant of language behaviour over time.

From the findings it is not possible to predict the future language maintenance of the Dutch and Polish children in this study. Time will show whether their current expressions of attitude will be effective. Hansen suggested that the pressure to conform with American norms and practice led second generation migrants to reject their parents' ethnicity and mother tongue, and to overconform to the American ideal, but that the third generation, being sure of its place in American society, could and did return to an interest in ethnic language and culture.

There was some suggestion that in two Polish families (the children being second generation only) older children were more

1 Quoted in Fishman and Nahinry in Fishman 1966 p. 343.
interested in relearning Polish once they had passed adolescence. Among families with no commitment to language and cultural maintenance it seems probable that the children will simply grow out of their ethnicity. There is no evidence that language maintenance is an indicator of lower level of acculturation¹ nor that such maintenance is a hindrance to acculturation.

Taking a wider view, differences in degrees of language maintenance can be expected to be due partly to factors present in migrant groups themselves partly to conditions in the host society, which in Australia can vary very widely, but rarely favour easy ethnic group language retention. A policy of migrant dispersion and a modern industrial economy have prevented the kind of homogeneous rural group settlement which makes language maintenance easy. The English language is almost unchallenged in its dominance and 'the core culture represented by the mass media will follow (the migrant) relentlessly wherever he goes' (Martin p.101.).

¹Indeed the evidence of Polish language maintenance in the families of Polish intellectuals may point the other way. Taft (1965) found a Polish intellectual group to be highly acculturated and identified and there is no evidence that these Canberra families were any different.
Australian native hostility to the public speaking of foreign languages necessarily restricts the domain in which such languages can be used; there is some evidence of this in the care which migrants take not to speak their language in front of Australians. Amongst the children it is clear that English itself occupies a domain, in that there are situations which the children consider English the only appropriate language. Relations with their own age group and play were nearly always conducted in English. Fishman\(^1\) found a similar domain with Puerto Rican adolescents in New Jersey.

A knowledge of the host society's language is a pre-requisite for acculturation and behavioural assimilation in Gordon's\(^2\) sense. Gordon points out that language is an intrinsic trait deriving from the core of the ethnic cultural heritage. However, behavioural assimilation can take place although cultural differences are preserved, providing that such preservation is not in direct conflict with the host society's values. National language maintenance in the home and among friends is not particularly visible, and traits of low visibility can be very resistant to change. The loss of their ancestral language is an optional accompaniment to acculturation; a kind of 'optional biculturalism'.

---

\(^1\) Fishman (1968b)

\(^2\) Gordon 1964
to bend Richardson's phrase.

Although an individual migrant's perception of the host society's attitude will affect his behaviour, his own attitudes are in turn chiefly affected by national identity. There are historically based differences between national groups in their attitudes to cultural and language maintenance. A model of language behaviour must take such differences into account, since without an adequate account of motivation socio-demographic factors associated with maintenance must play an ambiguous role. This is demonstrated by the list of factors compiled by Kloss. This is not to say socio-demographic factors are not important, particularly in negating efforts towards language maintenance. Maintaining bilingualism is hard work, and needs a wide circle of people with similar ideals e.g. an individual's choice of marriage partner will clearly affect his chances of maintaining his mother tongue. The choice of friends and marriage partner suggests the importance of large numbers of co-speakers. Large numbers are also needed to provide formal ethnic organisations which can reinforce language maintenance, such as the ethnic parish church, national club, national language newspaper and so forth. Even so, few people are likely to maintain both languages over all spheres of daily life.

1 Taft 1965 p.68.
2 In Fishman 1966.
In situations of stable bilingualism the two languages tend to be institutionalised, usually with a High/Low division. The High language is used in official formal situations and the Low language is that of intimate domestic use. It seems unlikely that this pattern will develop or anyway stabilize over time for any migrant group in this country, because all the children become fluent in English early as all their schooling is in that language.

A more likely outcome is that found amongst Polish/americans. Language maintenance is not at a high level among the third and fourth generation, but cultural organisations and cultural maintenance still flourish. ¹

In Australia at the present time most migrant groups are still being reinforced by the arrival of fellow countrymen. This can have the effect of reinforcing language maintenance. However, are increasing numbers of migrants/returning to Europe, and it seems possible that amongst economic migrants, those committed to their ancestral heritage may well return home, particularly if economic conditions in Europe are much the same or better than those in Australia. There is evidence in the studies described by Taft that many migrant intellectuals would like to leave Australia; in English they cannot communicate with their children except in

¹See Price in Borrie 1959.
if many do leave conscious language maintenance would certainly be reduced amongst migrants which resemble the Polish group in this study.

Class and ethnic differences in Australian society already support divergent value systems; official tribute is paid to cultural pluralism and the values of cultural diversity, but attitudes towards language maintenance are left vague. Large sums are expended on educating children (and adults) in foreign languages, but no encouragement is given to the existing pool of native foreign language speakers to maintain their bilingualism. There is no doubt that language skills have some value in diplomatic and commercial fields, and this is frequently cited as an important reason for supporting migrant language retention. However, it is almost certainly easier to teach a diplomat a foreign language than to educate a native language speaker without the other necessary qualifications, to become a diplomat.

There can be no doubt of the value of the mother tongue in holding families together, particularly in the first years of migration when the migrants field of social participation is narrowed. If adult members of the family do not become fluent in English they cannot communicate with their children except in their mother tongue. A lack of communication may have serious
consequences in loneliness among older people and delinquency among the young. However, it seems likely that problems may arise equally if there is great tension between parents and children over maintaining the language when the children do not wish to do so.

Finally, it seems particularly important that some official encouragement of bilingual proficiency be adopted for non-English migrants arriving in Australia in their adolescence. For many of these, immigration is a serious setback in their life chances. Interrupted schooling, inadequate English teaching and too little formal grounding in their own language can combine with damaging effects. Bernstein's work points to the importance of language in social perception and concept formation; these adolescents are in great need of help with language skills and trained help from bilingual teachers.

If Australia is to develop a national policy towards migrant languages, more needs to be known about the ideologies towards maintenance of the different national language groups; the contemporary degree of their language and cultural retention; and the measures which support such retention. Language questions in the national census would be valuable, as would small group studies among groups of different national origins. An interdisciplinary approach could be helpful, particularly in developing measures of bilingual proficiency.
amount of unpublished material relating to national language speaking by school children, and problems associated with bilingualism collected by State Education Departments in the school situation. A comparative survey of such material would be very valuable. An equally important, and relatively untouched field for study is the contemporary attitude of the Australian host society towards the language and cultural maintenance among migrant groups.
APPENDIX I

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

CHILDREN

Name______________________________________________________ Boy ( ) Girl ( )

Date of birth_____________________________________________

Place of birth_____________________________________________

If not born in Australia date of arrival here__________________

School ____________________________________________________

1. Do you understand Polish/Dutch when it is spoken to you?
   Never ____ Always ____ Sometimes ____

2. Do you speak Polish/Dutch well____ fairly well____ badly____

3. Have you relatives in Poland/Holland? Yes____ No____

4. Have any visited you? Yes____ No____
   Have you visited them? Yes____ No____
   Do you expect any visits? Yes____ No____

4. Do you ever see or have you seen your grandfather? Yes____ No____
   If yes, does (did) he speak to you in Polish/Dutch?
   Never ____ Always ____ Sometimes ____

5. Do you ever see or have you seen your grandmother? Yes____ No____
   If yes, does (did) she speak to you in Polish/Dutch?
   Never ____ Always ____ Sometimes ____
Do (did) you speak to her in Polish/Dutch?

Never_____ Always_____ Sometimes_____

6. Do you see or have you seen other relatives? Yes___ No___

If yes, do (did) they speak to you in Polish/Dutch?

Never_____ Always_____ Sometimes_____

Do (did) you speak to them in Polish/Dutch?

Never_____ Always_____ Sometimes_____

Have you relatives in Poland/Holland? Yes___ No___

Do you see them often sometimes never___

What language do they speak to you? __________

What language do you speak to them? __________

7. When your family's friends visit your house do they speak

Polish/Dutch: Never_____ Always_____ Sometimes_____

English: Never_____ Always_____ Sometimes_____

8. What language do you speak to your Polish/Dutch grown-up

family friends?

At home________________________

When with other people____________________

When in the street or places where there are mostly Australians:____________________

What language is spoken at meetings?____________________

9. Do you see Polish/Dutch children? Never_____ Often_____ Sometimes_____

10. Are your own age friends mostly Polish/Dutch_______

mostly Australian_________________

Polish____________________

some Dutch, some Australian_____________

other____________________
11. What language do you speak to Polish/Dutch friends of your own age?
   At your home
   At their home
   Outside the house, where there are mostly Australians

12. Do Australian friends of yours come to your house? Yes ___ No ___
    Do you visit Australian children's houses? Yes ___ No ___
    At Saturday or evening classes? Yes ___ No ___

13. Do you belong to any clubs or societies? Yes ___ No ___
    If so, which?
    Do you belong to any national clubs? Yes ___ No ___
    What language is spoken there?

14. Do you go to church? Yes ___ No ___
    If yes, where?
    Is Polish/Dutch spoken there? Never ___ Always ___ Sometimes ___

15. In what language do you say your prayers? ____________________

16. Do you go with your parents to any club or society meetings?
    Yes ___ No ___
    If so, which society?
    What language is spoken at meetings?

17. Have you ever had lessons in Polish/Dutch?
    At home? Yes ___ No ___
    At Saturday or evening classes? Yes ___ No ___
    At church classes? Yes ___ No ___
21. Do any members of your family read any books in Polish/Dutch anywhere else? __________________________________________________________________________

If you have had lessons did you enjoy them? Yes ___ No ___

If not, why not? __________________________________________________________________________

18. Will you have lessons in Polish/Dutch in the future?

At home? Yes ___ No ___

At Saturday or evening classes? Yes ___ No ___

At church classes? Yes ___ No ___

Anywhere else? __________________________________________________________________________

If it were possible, would you study Polish/Dutch at High School? Yes ___ No ___

19. Do any of these members of your family read any newspapers or magazines in Polish/Dutch?

Father __________________________________________________________________________

Mother __________________________________________________________________________

Brothers & Sisters __________________________________________________________________________

You yourself __________________________________________________________________________

Write the names in Polish/Dutch of the Polish/Dutch newspapers or magazines which any of these members of your family read.

25. Do you speak to your father in Polish/Dutch? __________________________________________________________________________

20. Do you read any newspapers in English?

Never ___ Regularly ___ Sometimes ___

(a) At home __________________________________________________________________________
21. Do any members of your family read any books in Polish/Dutch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Do your father speak to you in Polish/Dutch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any books in Polish/Dutch in your house? Yes No

23. Are letters in Polish/Dutch received in your home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you get letters in Polish/Dutch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) When with Polish/Dutch friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) When she is cross with you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Does your father speak to you in Polish/Dutch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If sometimes, on what occasions?

(a) At home
(b) In the street
(c) When with Polish/Dutch friends
(d) When he is cross with you
(e) When he is pleased with you
(f) Any other particular times

25. Do you speak to your father in Polish/Dutch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) At home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If sometimes, on what occasions?

(a) At home
26. Does your mother speak to you in Polish/Dutch?

(a) In the street
Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

(b) When with Polish/Dutch friends
Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

If sometimes, on what occasions?

(c) When she is cross with you
Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

(d) When she is pleased with you
Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

(e) Any other particular times

27. Do you speak to your mother in Polish/Dutch?

(a) At home
Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

(b) In the street
Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

(c) When with Polish/Dutch friends
Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

(d) Any other particular times

29. Do you speak to your brothers and sisters in Polish/Dutch?

(a) Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

(b) When with Polish/Dutch friends
Never____ Always____ Sometimes____

30. Do Australians seem to have any difficulty when you speak Polish/Dutch in front of them? Yes____ No____

If sometimes, on what occasions?

31. Do your teachers ask you to speak in English at school if they hear you speaking Polish/Dutch? Yes____ No____

Any other particular occasions

32. Do you think it is useful to speak two languages? Yes____ No____

Do you think it is useful to understand two languages? Yes____ No____

Why?__________
28. Do your brothers and sisters speak to you in Polish/Dutch?

Never____  Always____  Sometimes____

If sometimes, on what occasions?

(a) At home____

(b) In the street____

(c) When with Polish/Dutch friends____

(d) Any other particular times?_________________________

29. Do you speak to your brothers and sisters in Polish/Dutch?

Never____  Always____  Sometimes____

If sometimes, on what occasions?

(a) At home____

(b) In the street____

(c) When with Polish/Dutch friends____

(d) Any other particular times?_________________________

30. Do Australians seem annoyed or look at you curiously when you speak Polish/Dutch in front of them?  Yes___ No___

In the street or shops.  Never____  Always____  Sometimes____

At school.  Never____  Always____  Sometimes____

31. Do your teachers ask you to speak in English at school if they hear you speaking Polish/Dutch?  Never____  Always____  Sometimes____

32. Do you think it is useful to speak two languages?  Yes___ No___

Do you think it is useful to understand two languages?  Yes___ No___

Why?_________________________________________________
33. Do you think in Polish/Dutch? Never___ Sometimes___ Always___

34. Please write in English the meaning of the following words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Książka</td>
<td>Bril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolności</td>
<td>Terughoudend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojczyzna</td>
<td>Gezellig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Which language do you prefer? ____________________________

36. Do you think you would like your own children to speak two languages? Yes___ No___

Why? _______________________________________________________________________

4. Children: Name __________________________ Age __________ Place __________________________

5. How many years at school had you? __________

6. In what language were you taught? __________

7. What stage of education did you reach?

(a) part primary __________________________

(b) complete primary __________________________
Parent Questionnaire

MOTHER

Name __________________________________________

Place of birth (country, town or village) ________________________________

Age 25-34 __, 35-44 __, 45-54 __, 55+ ___

Date of arrival in Australia __________________________

1. Are you naturalized? Yes ____ No ____

2. Have you lived in any country other than Poland/Holland and Australia? Yes ____ No ____

   If yes, where ________________________________

   For how long ________________________________

3. Present occupation _____________________________

4. Children: Name Age Place of birth

   Yes ____ No ____ Don't know __________

   Do you attend Regularly ____ Occasionally ____ Never ____

   Do you meet with Polish/Dutch friends anywhere else? Regularly ____ Occasionally ____ Never ____

   Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your husband at home? ____________________________

5. How many years at school had you? ______

6. In what language were you taught? ______

7. What stage of education did you reach?

   (a) part primary ____________________________

   (b) complete primary ________________________

   Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your children outside the house? Regularly ____ Occasionally ____ Never ____
Please give details of any training, degree, diploma or certificates you hold.

7. For how many years did you learn English before you came to Australia? _____ years

8. Have you attended English classes since you arrived in Australia? Yes No

9. Apart from possible trips abroad would you like to spend the rest of your life in Australia? Yes No Don't know

10. Are there classes or lectures about Dutch/Polish culture available in Canberra?

   Yes No Don't know

   Do you attend Regularly Occasionally Never

12. Do you meet with Polish/Dutch friends anywhere else?

   Regularly Occasionally Never

13. Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your husband at home?

   Never Always Sometimes

   Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your husband outside the house when with Polish/Dutch friends?

   Never Always Sometimes

14. Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your children?

   At home: Never Always Sometimes

   Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your children outside the
Do your children speak Polish/Dutch to you?

Never___ Always___ Sometimes___

If you speak to them in Polish/Dutch, do they reply to you in Polish/Dutch? Never___ Always___ Sometimes___

Do your children speak Polish/Dutch well___ fairly well___ badly___

15. What language do you prefer your children to speak at home?___________________________

16. Have you tried to help them keep up their Polish/Dutch speaking? Yes___ No___

17. Do you speak any other language besides English and Polish/Dutch? Yes___ No___

If yes, which language?___________________________________________________________

18. Do you think it is useful to have two languages?

Yes___ No___

If yes, why?___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

19. Would you like your grandchildren to speak Polish/Dutch?

Yes___ No___ Don't know___
**FATHER**

Name __________________________

Place of birth (country, town or village) __________________________

Age 25-34__, 35-44__, 45-54__, 55+____

Date of arrival in Australia __________________________

1. Are you naturalized? Yes ____ No ____

2. Have you lived in any country other than Poland/Holland and Australia? Yes ____ No ____
   Do you attend regularly ____ occasionally ____ never ____
   If yes, where __________________________
   For how long __________________________

3. Present occupation __________________________

5. How many years at school had you? __________
   In what language were you taught? __________

6. What stage of education did you reach?
   (a) part primary ______
   (b) complete primary____
   (c) part secondary____
   (d) complete secondary____
   (e) part tertiary____
   (f) complete tertiary____

14. Please give details of any training, degree, diploma or certificate you hold.
   _____________________________________________________

______________________________________________________
7. For how many years did you learn English before you came to Australia? _____ years.

8. Have you attended English classes since you arrived in Australia? Yes ____ No _____

9. Apart from possible trips abroad would you like to spend the rest of your life in Australia? Yes ____ No ____ Don't know _____

10. Are there classes or lectures about Polish/Dutch culture available in Canberra? Yes ____ No ____ Don't know _____

11. Are you a member of a Polish/Dutch national organization? Yes ____ No ____

12. Do you meet with Dutch/Polish friends anywhere else? Regularly ____ Occasionally ____ Never ____

13. Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your wife at home? Never ____ Always ____ Sometimes ____

14. Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your children? At home: Never ____ Always ____ Sometimes ____

15. Do you speak Polish/Dutch to your children outside the house? Never ____ Always ____ Sometimes ____
Do your children speak Polish/Dutch to you?

Never ___ Always ___ Sometimes ___

15. What language do you prefer your children to speak at home? ____________________________________________

16. Have you tried to help them keep up their Polish/Dutch speaking? Yes ___ No ___

17. Do you speak any other language besides English and Polish/Dutch? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, which language? ____________________________________________

18. Do you think it is useful to have two languages? Yes ___ No ___

If yes, why? ____________________________________________

19. Would you like your grandchildren to speak Polish/Dutch? Yes ___ No ___ Don't know ___
APPENDIX II

THE WORD TEST

(Question 34. Child Questionnaire)

Three words were chosen by a Polish and a Dutch resident in Canberra, which they felt were within the comprehension of a 12 year old. The first word in each language was an ordinary concrete object for which the children, if they understood any of their mother tongue, would know the appropriate word. The words were 'książka' (Polish - book) and 'bril' (Dutch - spectacles). Most of the children did know these words, although it was difficult for Dutch children whose parents never needed spectacles nor mislaid their sunglasses. The second word was chosen to be one which was not easily translated into English because the connotations of the word differed between the two languages, thus if the children had a good comprehension of both languages they would automatically elaborate their answers to allow for this. The words chosen were 'wolnosc' (Polish - freedom, which carries the connotations of national independence and freedom from foreign invaders) and 'terughoudend' (Dutch - reserved, shy, literally dragged back). These words proved too difficult for many of the children. Those Polish children who heard adults talking about Polish history sometimes knew the word; the Dutch word seemed difficult even to many Dutch adults. In both languages the meaning
of the words can be guessed at, and where the children said let or allow for 'wolność' and where they said dragged back for 'terughoudend' the author allowed half marks.

The third word posed a different problem. It was planned to use a word denoting a concept in the national language which does not exist in English. The Polish word 'ojczyzna' (homeland, heritage with an intranslatable Polish emotion of national loyalty) was rarely recognised by children. Those who had no idea of the meaning tended to confuse it with God the Father, not so much for its overtones of reverence as for the fact that part of the word means father. By comparison, the Dutch word 'gezellig' (meaning comfortable, social with a quite untranslatable overtone of warmth and social cheer) was understood by nearly every Dutch child, since they probably heard it whenever the family was having a good time. A score of two and a half or three among the Dutch children, therefore, does not reflect the same intellectual comprehension of their parents' language as does a similar score amongst the Polish children.
Analysis of Answers to Question 34 (Child Questionnaire)

A  Polish Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Answer correct</th>
<th>close guess</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Księgka</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolnosc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojczyzna</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score on Word Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score on Active Usage Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B  Dutch Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Answer correct</th>
<th>close guess</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bril</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terughoudend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gezellig</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score on Word Test

Score on Active Usage Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score on Active Usage Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

CODING CATEGORIES

To facilitate tests of significance the original response categories were collapsed to provide the following categories:

**Polish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi Square Categories</th>
<th>Scale Score Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child's attendance at Saturday School</td>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>Don't attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence in Australia</td>
<td>Before 1957</td>
<td>After 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with grandparents and relatives</td>
<td>In touch</td>
<td>Not in touch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference by father for language spoken in home</td>
<td>Polish (including both)</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's level of education</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Chi Square Categories</td>
<td>Scale Score Categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken by father other than Polish and English</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>professional, managerial, self employed</td>
<td>professional &amp; managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clerical, craftsmen and skilled</td>
<td>self employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others, including unskilled labourers</td>
<td>clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence in Australia</td>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>craftsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with grandparents and relatives</td>
<td>Don't attend</td>
<td>service &amp; skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In touch</td>
<td>unskilled &amp; others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not in touch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic club attendance</td>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>Same categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't attend</td>
<td>&quot;Don't attend&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's attendance at Saturday School</td>
<td>Attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group differences between Poles and Dutch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken by father other than Polish and English</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>professional, managerial, self employed</td>
<td>professional &amp; managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clerical, craftsmen and skilled</td>
<td>self employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others, including unskilled labourers</td>
<td>clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>craftsmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>service &amp; skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unskilled &amp; others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dutch

#### Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic background</th>
<th>Active Usage Scale</th>
<th>Length of residence in Australia</th>
<th>Contacts with grandparents and relatives</th>
<th>Preference by father for language spoken in home</th>
<th>Father's level of education</th>
<th>Languages spoken by father other than Polish and English</th>
<th>Father's occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nought 0 to 10</td>
<td>Before 1957 Same categories</td>
<td>In touch Not in touch</td>
<td>Polish (including both) English</td>
<td>Primary Secondary Tertiary</td>
<td>None 1 2+</td>
<td>professional, managerial, self employed clerical, craftsmen and skilled others, including unskilled labourers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scale Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nought</th>
<th>1 to 10</th>
<th>0 to 3</th>
<th>4 to 6</th>
<th>7 to 10</th>
<th>0 to 10</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Usage Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residence in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandparents and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference by father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for language spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's level of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages spoken by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father other than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish and English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional, managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clerical, craftsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others, including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unskilled labourers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

THE GUTTMAN SCALE

In order to construct the scale the responses 'always', 'somtimes' and 'never' were dichotomized at 'sometimes'. The division is between speaking and not speaking the appropriate language. Because the numbers in the sample are so small the items were not further tested for scalability.

As there were so many Dutch children with a score of zero, the Reproducibility Index was calculated excluding the zero scores. The Reproducibility Index for the Dutch was 88.99%, and for the Poles 97.55%.

Guttman Scale - Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Older Friends</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Prayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guttman Scale - Poles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Older Friends</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Prayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Deviations

#### Guttman Scale - Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviations</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Older Siblings</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Prayers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Guttman Scale (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviations</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Older Siblings</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Prayers</th>
<th>friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deviations</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Older Siblings</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Prayers</th>
<th>friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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APPENDIX V

Guttman Scale (Contd.)

THE QUEANBEYAN SAMPLE

(For discussion see Guilford - 'Psychometric Methods'

There were some differences in the level of achievement of children from Queanbeyan and those from Canberra. There were twelve children from Queanbeyan, six of them in fifth grade and six in sixth grade.

Nine of the twelve children attended Catholic private schools.

The distribution of children on the Active Usage Scale was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father's occupation amongst Queanbeyan children cross-tabulated with Active Usage Scale score was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI-VII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One father was missing. Seven families had arrived in Australia before 1957, five families after 1957.

The Queanbeyan children were more often in touch with grandparents and relatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact with relatives</th>
<th>Canberra 1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>Queanbeyan 1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact with relatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with relatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives nearby</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

THE QUEANBEYAN SAMPLE

There were some differences between the sample of children from Queanbeyan and those from Canberra. There were twelve children from Queanbeyan, six of them in fifth grade and six in sixth grade. Nine of the twelve children attended Catholic private schools. The distribution of children on the Active Usage Scale was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Usage Scale (0-2, 4-6, 8-10)</th>
<th>Queanbeyan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father’s occupation amongst Queanbeyan children cross-tabulated with Active Usage Scale score was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s Occupation</th>
<th>Queanbeyan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-IV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI-VII</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One father was missing. Seven families had arrived in Australia before 1957, five families after 1957.

The Queanbeyan children were more often in touch with grandparents and relatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact with Relatives</th>
<th>Canberra</th>
<th>Queanbeyan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with relatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact with relatives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives nearby</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attendance at Saturday Schools was as follows:--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Club membership of parents was as follows:--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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