

# John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Ethnic Styles of Speaking in European Metropolitan Areas*.  
Edited by Friederike Kern and Margret Selting.  
© 2011. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)).

Please contact [rights@benjamins.nl](mailto:rights@benjamins.nl) or consult our website: [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at [www.benjamins.com](http://www.benjamins.com)

# Emerging Moroccan and Turkish varieties of Dutch

## Ethnolects or ethnic styles?

Frans Hinskens

Meertens Instituut (KNAW) / VU University, Amsterdam

Large-scale immigration, which resulted either from the processes of decolonization or from labour migration, led to the development of new ethnolectal varieties of Dutch.

Following a brief discussion concerning the definition of this notion and a modest survey of the relevant literature (both international and for the Dutch situation), a rough demographic sketch of the present-day situation of ethnic minorities in The Netherlands will be presented. Next, a large ongoing research project into the emergent Moroccan and Turkish ethnolectal varieties of Dutch in two major cities will be introduced. This project targets at answering three different sets of questions regarding ethnolects.

One set of questions concerns the linguistic makeup of ethnolects: to which extent are they rooted in substrates, in phenomena that are typical of second language acquisition and in endogenous non-standard varieties? Another set of questions concerns the place of the ethnolect in the verbal repertoires of its speakers. Yet other questions concern the spread of ethnolectal features to other ethnic groups. It is argued why the three sets of questions all emanate from a language-centered rather than an ethnographic approach to ethnolects.

After a sketch of the methods and design as well as the resulting database, some first findings will be presented regarding a particular non-indigenous feature in the province of phonology, discussing its nature, probable origin, use and incipient social spread. For this contribution the use of the feature has been analysed in conversational speech of a small subset of the subjects in the research design in a range of interactional situations; the analyses zoom in on several different dimensions in the distribution of the feature.

The findings for the micro-social dimensions studied partly bridge the seeming gap between quantitative (Labovian) approaches to language variation on the one hand and qualitative, partly interpretive (Gumperz-type) approaches on the other. There appear to be interesting and highly plausible relations between the quantitative patterns in the subjects' use of the feature and several

mutually related aspects of the interlocutor's background. This leads to a discussion of the stylistic meaning of these patterns and of ethnolectal variation in general.

Finally it will be argued that international research cooperation could greatly help to unravel internal, external and extra-linguistic forces underlying the development and use of these new non-standard features as well as their diffusion to the verbal repertoires of other cultural groups.

## 1. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Like other European nations, the Netherlands (as well as the equally Dutch speaking northern part of Belgium) have gone through dramatic societal changes, including the 'modernisation' of society. Large-scale immigration, which resulted either from the processes of decolonization or from labour migration, led to the development of new ethnolectal varieties of Dutch.

After a brief consideration of the place of the study of ethnolects (Section 2), a concise discussion concerning the definition of the notion of ethnolect and a survey of some relevant literature (2.1), a demographic sketch of the present-day situation of ethnic minorities in The Netherlands will be presented (2.2). Next, some historical and present-day Dutch ethnolects are sketched (2.3).

The main part of this paper is devoted to a large ongoing research project into the emergent Moroccan and Turkish ethnolectal varieties of Dutch in two major Dutch cities. This project (to be introduced in Section 3) targets at answering three different sets of questions regarding ethnolects (3.1). One set of questions concerns the linguistic makeup of ethnolects: to which extent are they rooted in traits of the original mother tongue of the ethnic group at issue, in phenomena that are typical of second language acquisition and in surrounding indigenous (urban) dialects? Another set of questions concerns the place of ethnolects in the verbal repertoires of their speakers. Yet other questions concern the spread of ethnolectal features to other ethnic groups (or 'heritage groups'). For most of the research questions presented, some relevant findings for the ethnolects of Dutch sketched in Section 2.3 as well as modern ethnolects of German and English are briefly discussed. Following a sketch of the methods and design (3.2) that serve as the instruments to answer the various research questions, some first findings will be presented.

---

1. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and the editors for their highly useful comments on an earlier version of this contribution. They are not responsible for any of the shortcomings this text may have.

Attention will be focussed on a non-indigenous variable feature in the province of phonology (Section 4), discussing its nature, probable origin, use and beginning social spread (4.1). For this contribution 248 observations of the use of the feature have been analysed in conversational speech of a small subset of the subjects in the research design in a range of interactional situations; the analyses zoom in on several different dimensions in the distribution of the feature (4.2). In the discussion of the findings (Sections 5 and 6), the notion of (ethnic) style will be discussed; moreover the question ‘ethnolects or ethnic styles?’ as well as the two types of approaches to this type of variation sketched in Section 3.1 will be addressed.

This contribution concludes with a modest sketch of some possible contours of and desiderata for the future study of ethnolects (Section 7).

## 2. The crossroads between language contact and quantitative variation

Ethnolects are a relatively new area in the study of language contact and bilingualism. Because of the nature of ethnolectal variation, it is also relevant to quantitative sociolinguistics.

In this section, attention will first be devoted to considerations regarding the definition of the notion of ethnolect; then the Dutch situation will be succinctly discussed.

### 2.1 Ethnolects

In some of the cities of Northwestern Europe ethnic minorities seem to develop into the new lower class or even ‘underclass’ of society. Especially among young people in cities with high concentrations of migrant workers, divergent new varieties of the dominant language are emerging. Kotsinas (1988) reports that younger members of ethnic minorities in Stockholm have developed their own substandard varieties of Swedish for in-group use on the basis of both their mother tongues and the local urban nonstandard variety of Swedish. Similar systems have evolved in many other cities of Northwestern Europe.<sup>2</sup> The originally non-indigenous intermediate varieties, which have developed among members of ethnic minorities, are sometimes referred to as ‘ethnolects’.

---

2. Cf. Hinskens, Auer & Kerswill (2005: 35) for references to and brief sketches of some relevant studies.

In the southwestern part of the USA an English vernacular variety has emerged among members of the Chicano community. Bills (1976) discusses the question if this variety should be considered as the result of Spanish interference in the L2 English or rather as a discrete variety of English. He argues for the status of a discrete variety (Vernacular Chicano English, henceforth VCE) for three reasons: (1) the features of VCE cannot be predicted on the basis of a contrastive analysis of Spanish and English, (2) VCE is variable, but the variability is structured and sociolinguistically conditioned, rather than in terms of the English skills of its speakers, (3) “VCE is not a [...] transitional phenomenon”, as it is also used by Chicanos who do not speak Spanish. In this connection it is remarkable that Danesi (1985:118) defines an ethnolect as “the variety of a language that results when speakers of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds attempt to speak the dominant language (e.g. ‘Chicano English’)”. In Danesi’s view, ethnolects are hence products of language shift à la Thomason & Kaufman (1988). In this view, e.g. Hiberno and Scottish English also count as (former) ethnolects.

In Androutsopoulos’ (2001:2) view, an ethnolect is “a variety of the majority language (or ‘host language’) which is used by and regarded as a vernacular for speakers of a particular ethnic descent and is marked by certain contact phenomena”. Language shift and incomplete second language acquisition play a minor role in Androutsopoulos’ conception.

Speaking an ethnolect is often not in the first place a matter of not being able to speak more standard-like, but rather not wanting to do so. In certain situations, people deliberately speak this way, even though they control the standard or a standard-nearer variety. Often an ethnolect is therefore one of the ingredients of youth language (or street language). Sometimes the minority language has even been maintained, with speakers code switching and mixing the minority language, the dominant language and the ethnolect (cf. Muysken, forthcoming).

Hence ethnolects are not necessarily learner’s varieties, witness the fact that, in older migrant communities such as the ethnic Italians in North America, many speakers also control the standard variety. Moreover, it appears that these varieties are not necessarily in every respect approximations of the standard variety; rather, many of these systems contain features of the surrounding dialects.

Most current definitions of the notion of ethnolect are stipulative rather than descriptive in nature, in that they are proposals on what is meant by the notion; the essence of the phenomenon referred to as ethnolect is still partly unknown.

Irrespective of these considerations, in a multi-ethnic society as the present-day Netherlands ethnolects have not only a significant past,<sup>3</sup> but doubtlessly also a big future.

Unlike dialects, koinè's (or 'regiolects'), and other homegrown varieties of a language, and unlike most transplanted varieties,<sup>4</sup> ethnolects typically are not the mother tongue for the first generations of speakers. Unlike export varieties and 'daughter languages', ethnolects usually develop in the language area or at least in the interaction with native speakers of the language. Schematically:

Table 1. Four situations and the related types of language variety

		Originally mother tongue?	
		Yes	No
In the same language area?	Yes	dialects, sociolects, ethnolects koinè's, varieties of the standard language	ethnolects
	No	transplanted varieties	daughter languages (mixed languages, pidgins, creoles)

In connection with the functional dimension the question arises if ethnolects are Mediums for Interethnic Communication or rather Mediums for Community Solidarity, in Baker's (2000) terminology. In the latter case, ethnolects will probably function mainly or only as in-group codes; in that case, the emblematic value of the ethnolectal variants, which are often quite distinct from the prestigious norm, is mainly defined by their signaling ethnic identification and solidarity.

Elusiveness in both social and linguistic respects as well as great variability seem to be an important characteristic of ethnolects. The quantitative study of systematically collected data may help to elucidate some aspects of this type of language variety.

## 2.2 Migration to and migrants in the Netherlands

In the course of the 19th and 20th centuries, in Western Europe the economic importance of agriculture diminished considerably in favour of the industrial economy. After the Second World War, the shortage of industrial workers which resulted from the transition to postindustrial economies with heavy service

3. Cf. Section 2.3 below.

4. Export varieties are varieties of a language which are spoken in a community outside the original speech community, such a.s. the descendants of Hunsrück dialects of German as presently spoken in parts of Brazil.

sectors drew ‘migrant workers’ to Western Europe. With respect to labour migration, an interesting and unexpected illustration is constituted by the Catholic church, traditionally big in the southern parts of the Netherlands (as well as in Belgium – including the Dutch speaking, northern part). While in 1975 there were 1779 Catholic priests in the Netherlands, in 2005 there were only 788 left. About a hundred, that is one eighth, of the present-day priests in the Netherlands are ‘allochthones’ (administratively speaking: people who do not have a Dutch passport); very many of these allochthonous priests come from former missionary areas such as India, Ghana and the Philippines (*Volkscrant* March 21, 2006, source: Nijmeegs Instituut voor Missiologie).

Apart from labour migration, decolonisation played an important role. In the course of the decolonisation processes, inhabitants of the former colonies settled in Western Europe; as a result of these developments, presently considerable numbers of people with Indonesian and Moluccan, Surinamese as well as Antillean backgrounds live in the Netherlands.

According to an OECD report from January 2004, foreigners (defined as people with a foreign passport) made up 4.3% of the Dutch population at the time – cf. Germany 8.9%, Belgium 8.2%, and the UK 4.4%. In 2001 the total immigration into the Netherlands numbered 94,500 persons; 3.3% of these people came from the USA, 5.4% from Germany and 6.2% from the UK, 5.1% came from Turkey and 5.2% from Morocco. According to figures from the Dutch central bureau for statistics (CBS), in the years to follow, the percentages of the latter two groups shrunk to 2.4% (2005) and 2.1% (2006) for Moroccans and to 3.4% (2005) and 3.2% (2006) for Turks.

In Dutch demographical figures, people from Turkey and Morocco are counted among the non-western allochthones. The percentage of non-western allochthones of the population of the Netherlands has grown from 7.6% in 1996, over 8.9% in 2000 to 10.6% in 2007 (CBS).

According to CBS, no less than 43% of the population of the four big cities Amsterdam, Utrecht, Rotterdam and The Hague are foreigners. Table 2 contains figures regarding recent migration out of and into these four cities in the period 1995–2004.

**Table 2.** Recent migration into and out of the four major Dutch cities, 1995–2004

Direction of flow	Total numbers	>	Non-western migrants
out of the cities	over 210,000		0
into the cities	over 185,000		over 55,000

**Table 3.** Percentage final exam candidates in 2001 in four different types of secondary education, broken down for natives and non-western migrants in the four major cities (source: *Metro*, October 23, 2002)

School type	Natives	Non-western migrants
lower vocational	22	44
lower general secondary	24	32
higher general secondary	25	14
pre-university	29	10

**Table 4.** Percentage of the populations of natives and non-western migrants receiving a higher vocational or academic education in two different academic years (CBS)

Higher education type	Year	Natives	Non-western migrants
higher vocational	1995–1996	17	11
	2002–2003	19	14
academic	1995–1996	9,5	9,5
	2002–2003	11	8

Out of the 55.000 non-western migrants who moved to one of the big cities during this period, 50.000 were in the age range between 18 and 29 years old (source: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute – NIDI).

Although the proportion of foreigners among the unemployed part of the Dutch labour force (males 4.5%, females 5%) is small compared to the three neighbouring countries, their position is disadvantageous when compared to the native population (males 2.1%, females 2.5% unemployed). There may well be a relationship with their educational backgrounds; cf. Table 3.

Whereas the proportion of final exam candidates among the native pupils slightly increases with the educational level, for second or third generation non-western migrants the figures show a dramatically inverse pattern; in this group almost half of the pupils receives a lower vocational training. Table 4 shows how both groups of young people fare with respect to higher, i.e. post-secondary education.

Overall, a considerably smaller proportion of the second or third generation non-western migrants receives some type of higher education than is the case for native young people; moreover, the proportion of the second or third generation non-western migrants who receive academic training is decreasing. In other words, their chances in the Dutch society are deteriorating. Apparently, in connection with the access to secondary education ethnicity has taken over the role that used to be played by age: before World War II some 42% of the Dutch

**Table 5.** The official numbers of second generation non-western allochthones and specifically Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands over the past decade (all figures CBS)

	1996	2000	2007
total non-western allochthones	410,000	523,000	723,000
Moroccans	85,000	110,000	162,000
Turks	104,000	131,000	173,000

population had merely had primary education, in 1959 that percentage had increased to over 80% (Livestro 2006). The negative effect of ethnic background on educational success is alarming, the more so since the official numbers of second generation non-western allochthones and specifically Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands<sup>5</sup> have grown considerably over the past decade, witness the figures in Table 5.

Does the linguistic situation of these groups somehow reflect their societal position? Are specifically Moroccan and Turkish ethnolects of Dutch developing? And if so, what is their relationship to other ethnolects of Dutch?

### 2.3 Ethnolects of Dutch

One of the oldest known and documented ethnolects of Dutch is Jewish Dutch, which was rooted for the main part in Yiddish, spoken by Ashkenazic Jews. One or two features of Jewish Dutch (including h-dropping) had their origin in Ladin or Judesmo (Jewish Spanish and Portuguese), originally spoken by Sephardic Jews. In the 19th century, after the so-called Emancipation (i.e. cultural assimilation, which was enforced by the then French government of the Netherlands) of Dutch Jewry, most speakers were bilingual Yiddish/Dutch. Nowadays Jewish Dutch is practically extinct.

As far as the recent past is concerned: ever since the second quart of the 20th century there is a steadily growing Chinese community (in 1988 estimated at a total of around 45,000 people – Van de Berg & Pieke 1991: 47), while after World War II considerable numbers of Ambonese people from Indonesia settled in the Netherlands. After approximately 1975 the immigration from Surinam has

---

5. The designation ‘second generation’ suggests more transparency than is warranted. The first generation consists largely of the migrant workers who came to the Netherlands, but in many cases their descendants were raised partly in Turkey or Morocco, partly in the Netherlands. Some of these children have lived in their parents’ home country during several years of their youth. And very many of them have married a partner from Turkey or Morocco.

gradually reached significant proportions. More generally, with respect to the immigration from the former Dutch colonies, the Surinamese and Antillians are not only the most recent (and still ongoing, especially as far as the Antilles is concerned), but also among the most influential cultural groups.<sup>6</sup> In contrast to Jewish Dutch and Indonesian Dutch, which according to De Vries (2005) is gradually fading away, Curaçao and Suriname ethnolects of Dutch are alive and kicking. These ethnolects are spoken by people who/whose ancestors came from present and former Dutch colonies.<sup>7</sup> Almost none of these modern ethnolects of Dutch have been studied systematically in linguistic depth.

### 3. The Roots of ethnolects project

It is unclear how many members of the various ethnic minority groups speak an ethnolectal variety of Dutch and to which extent and under which conditions they do so. Ethnolects have hardly been systematically studied in linguistic detail as yet, neither for the Dutch situation nor for other language areas; moreover, so far a relevant coherent theory seems to be lacking. One of the not so many systematic studies addressing linguistic questions is the research project *The roots of ethnolects. An experimental comparative study*,<sup>8</sup> which will be introduced in this section.

#### 3.1 Research questions and some pertinent findings from other studies

The project concentrates on the emergence, position and social spread of two young ethnolects of Dutch in Amsterdam and Nijmegen. These are spoken by second generation migrants of Turkish and Moroccan descent. Table 6 contains

---

6. Especially for several types of background information on various ethnic minority groups and their languages the contributions to De Ruiter (ed., 1991) are still highly useful.

7. Cf. Den Besten & Hinskens (2005: 289–293) on Jewish Dutch and Hinskens & Muysken (2007) on (among other things) Jewish Dutch and the Chinese and Surinamese communities in present-day Amsterdam.

8. Supervised by Pieter Muysken and the present author and officially started January 2005. The other researchers involved in this project, which is financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), are Esther van Krieken, Wouter Kusters (in 2005 and 2006) and, at present, Linda van Meel and Arien van Wijngaarden. For more information cf. the project website <http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/meertensnet/wdb.php?url=\ethnolectproject/roots.html>.

**Table 6.** Three relevant demographic facts about the Dutch cities of Amsterdam and Nijmegen

City	Total n of inhabitants	Moroccan descent (%)	Turkish (%)
Amsterdam	742,783	8.7	5.1
Nijmegen	158,215	2.0	3.2

some relevant demographic facts (A.D. 2005) about the cities of Amsterdam and Nijmegen.

Among the research questions are the following:

- Q1. *Which aspects of language use / which components of the grammar characterise ethnolects as distinct varieties?*
- Q2. *To what extent are ethnolects based on interference from the original language of the ethnic group in question ('substrate effects')?*
- Q3. *... on properties resulting from processes of second language acquisition?*
- Q4. *... and on local (urban) dialects or other indigenous non-standard varieties?*
- Q6. *Is there any evidence of spread of ethnic varieties outside of the ethnic group?*
- Q8. *To what extent can speakers of an ethnolect shift to more standard varieties and to non-ethnic non-standard varieties?*

As far as Q1 is concerned, Table 7 contains (non-exhaustive) inventories of features of modern ethnolectal varieties of Dutch which are spoken by people who / whose ancestors came from former Dutch colonies.

There are striking similarities between these ethnolects of Dutch, although Malay/Javanese, Papiamentu and Sranan, respectively, are unrelated and do not have much in common. Both Indonesian Dutch (De Vries 2005:72–74) and Curaçao Dutch (Joubert 2005:37–39, 45–47) are characterized by (among other things) deviating usage of grammatical gender as well as by the variable non-realization of the adverbial pronoun *er*, 'there', and (pronominal) *het*, 'it'. The bilabial realisation of /w/ occurs in Indonesian, Curaçao and Surinamese Dutch; this also holds for the voiceless realisation of the fricatives.

Dittmar & Steckbauer (2007:78–81) discuss features of the (mainly Turkish) ethnolect of German that is presently spoken in Berlin; the features are phonetic (segmental), prosodic (word and phrasal stress), morphosyntactic, semantic, 'syntactic-semantic', lexical and pragmatic in nature. Keim (2007:95–96) lists features of (again mainly) Turkish ethnolectal German as it is spoken today in the German city of Mannheim; the features of this variety, which the speakers refer to as 'unseren Ghettoslang', i.e. 'our ghetto slang', are from the provinces of morphology, morphosyntax, syntax, lexicon, pragmatics as well as from "a complex of prosodic-phonetic features".

**Table 7.** Features of three ethnic varieties of Dutch, as mentioned in the literature mentioned below

	Indonesian	Curaçao	Surinamese
<b>Phonology</b>			✓
slightly nasalised /E/ before nasals			✓
bilabial /w/	✓	✓	✓
apical /r/			✓
devoicing of fricatives	✓	✓	
seemingly deviating word stress	✓		
realisation of /ɣ/ as [h]		✓	
<b>Morphology</b>			
deviating gramm. gender	✓	✓	
variable 'omission' <i>er</i> and (pron.) <i>het</i>	✓	✓	
<i>hun</i> (dative 'them') as subject pron.			✓
<b>Syntax</b>			
<i>gaan</i> ('go') auxiliary			✓
frequent SVO word order			✓
subordinate clauses without <i>dat</i>			✓

In his study among English, Pakistani and Black Caribbean groups in Birmingham, UK, Kahn (2006) focussed on one morphological (past tense BE) and four phonological phenomena (the voiced and voiceless interdental fricatives and the diphthongs in items such as *goat* and *price*).

In connection with Q2, Labov's (2001:250–256) finding regarding r-vocalisation in the English of ethnic Italians in Philadelphia is relevant: although phonetically the 'Italian American' realisation of /r/ does not differ from that of other groups of speakers of American English, from the distribution of r-vocalisation it appears that the 'Italian-American' /r/ has another sonority value than the /r/ as it is used in other mainstream varieties of American English. Cf. also Kern's contribution to this volume, briefly discussed below, sub Q8.

Evidence for the assumption in Q3 is provided by Cornips (ms). Referring to unpublished work by Unsworth, Cornips shows that the overgeneralisation of Dutch common gender at the expense of the grammatical common-neutre distinction does not only occur in L2 but also in bilingual L1 speakers (in the age range between 5 and 17 year old) of Dutch.

In connection with Q4, it is relevant that the voiceless realisation of fricatives which occurs in Indonesian, Curaçao and Surinamese Dutch (Table 1) also occurs in indigenous (non- and substandard) varieties of Dutch; this also holds for the use of *hun* (dative 'them') as a subject pronoun. Further research is needed to

determine if and to which extent the use in Surinamese Dutch of *gaan* ('go') as an auxiliary is similar to that in the Flemish dialects of Dutch.

One of the questions regarding features of specific ethnolects is where they come from. Another question is where they go to. Chambers (2003: 105–107) demonstrated how speech characteristics of the English of ethnic Italians in Toronto seem to spread to the ethnic Greeks in East End, a neighbourhood where both groups coexist. The conscious adoption of speech characteristics of other ethnic groups has been referred to as 'crossing' (Rampton 1995). Independent of the question if the adoption proceeds consciously or not, is there any evidence of spread of Turkish Dutch or Moroccan Dutch features outside of the ethnic groups (Q6)?

Certain features of Jewish Dutch may have spread to indigenous varieties of Dutch; among them is the present-day Amsterdam variant of /s/. In Jewish Dutch, pre- and postconsonantal /s/ was variably palatalized. For centuries most Dutch Jews lived in Amsterdam. The observation by Winkler (1874: 88) and Prins (1916: 10) that in the main Jewish neighbourhood ('ghetto') in Amsterdam, Jewish Dutch also used to be spoken by non-Jews seems to be 'circumstantial evidence' for the hypothesis that the characteristic Amsterdam 'grave' and slightly palatal pronunciation of /s/ may derive from the so-called 'ghetto-pronunciation' of Dutch (Hinskens 2004: §5.3).

Keim (2007: 109) goes so far as to claim that the emergence of ethnolectal variation "is characteristic of *multilingual* groups where speakers of different native languages use ethnolectal forms of the standard variety of the resident country as a kind of lingua franca" (my emphasis and translation – FH). Multi-ethnic features are thus features which are shared by several different groups. Deppermann (2007) discusses the use of 'Türkendeutsch' (Turkish German) by non-Turkish, including autochthonous Germans. Auer (2003) refers to this type of borrowing as 'secondary' and 'tertiary ethnolect'.

With respect to individual ethnolect speakers the question arises to what extent can speakers of an ethnolect shift to more standard varieties and to non-ethnic non-standard varieties (Q8). There are indications that to speakers who control the standard or standard-nearer varieties, ethnolect features are a means for stylisation and playing with identities. Keim & Knöbl (2007) present some findings of a longitudinal case study of Murat, a young man of Turkish extraction, living in Mannheim. He has been recorded when he was 17 and 19 years old. Detailed linguistic analyses made plain that in a section of his verbal repertoire Murat indeed grew towards "standard-near and elaborate" German (p. 194, my translation, FH). Kern (this volume) goes one step further, demonstrating that in Turkish German, rhythm (as constituted in accent isochrony and particular

metrical stress patterns resulting in ‘utterance isochrony’)<sup>9</sup> shows “systematic and conversationally functional” variation. This variation is used “either as a powerful contextualization device for sequence organization, or as a rhetorical device in turn construction.”

There is an obvious relationship between Q4 and Q8, on the understanding that Q4 is a question about the ethnolectal varieties (or ethnic styles), while Q8 concerns the place of the ethnolect in the verbal repertoires of their speakers.

In general, there are two distinct approaches to the study of ethnolects, the language centered and the ethnographic approach. The *Roots of ethnolects* project is an example of the language centered approach. Whereas the ethnographic approach conceives language systems as infinite resources from which speakers may freely choose to shape their identity, the language centered approach tries to disentangle the laws, generalisations and restrictions on these resources. The methodology of the *Roots of ethnolects* project, which will be sketched in the next subsection, reflects its language centered orientation.

In Section 4 a quantitative case study will then be presented which was carried out on a small fraction of the data collected for the *Roots of ethnolects* project. In Section 5 the method and findings of this case study will be related to the distinction between language centered and the ethnographic approaches to ethnolectal variation.

### 3.2 Methods and design

In order to answer the various research questions, a study was designed that is based on recordings from extensive fieldwork. The fieldwork data were (and A.D. 2008, to an extent, are still being) gathered such that they fit a factorial design, constituted by equal numbers of young male speakers from Amsterdam and Nijmegen, of two age groups and three backgrounds: Moroccan, Turkish and ‘white’ Dutch. The speakers with Moroccan and Turkish backgrounds grew up bilingually in the Netherlands; hence they are also native speakers of some variety of modern Dutch. Among the ‘white’ Dutch boys, a distinction is made between those with strong and those with weak network ties with boys from other ethnic groups. Cf. Table 8.

Except for the ‘white’ Dutch boys who have but few friends from other ethnic groups (‘weak inter-ethnic ties’), four recordings are being made of every single

---

9. Phenomena that are closely related to what Dittmar & Steckbauer (2007) refer to as variation in word and phrasal stress (my translation – FH) as well as to what Keim (2007) refers to as “a complex of prosodic-phonetic features”. Cf. above sub Q1.

Table 8. The speakers design for the *Roots of ethnolects* project

City	Main language background	Age group	
		12 years old	18 to 20 years old
Amsterdam	Moroccan	6	6
	Turkish	6	6
	'white' Dutch, strong inter-ethnic ties	6	6
	'white' Dutch, weak inter-ethnic ties	6	6
Nijmegen	Moroccan	6	6
	Turkish	6	6
	'white' Dutch, strong inter-ethnic ties	6	6
	'white' Dutch, weak inter-ethnic ties	6	6

speaker; three recordings concern conversations, one with a speaker whose main background is Moroccan, one with a speaker with a Turkish background and one with a 'white' Dutch boy with friends from other ethnic groups. Additional recordings of these speakers concern individual elicitation sessions.

In the remainder of this contribution, attention will be paid to several aspects of the *Roots of ethnolects* project; from here on this contribution describes work in progress.

#### 4. A feature of Moroccan ethnolectal Dutch

As was shown in Table 7 above, one of the phonological characteristics of Surinamese Dutch is the variable nasalization of / $\epsilon$ / before nasals. In the recordings for the *Roots of ethnolects* project, several speakers with a Turkish background nasalize any lax vowel preceding /n/ which is tautosyllabically followed by some other consonant. This phenomenon is exotic in the sense that it does not occur in any indigenous variety of Dutch.

Not only do ethnolects contain more linguistic variables, the number of different variants (realisations) of prior-existing linguistic variables is sometimes higher than in indigenous varieties. E.g., the southern Dutch dialects (including the one spoken in Nijmegen) have a relatively palatal realization of the velar fricative / $\gamma$ /,<sup>10</sup> whereas the western and northern dialects do not. The Turkish and (even more so) Moroccan speakers in our sample add uvular and pharyngeal realizations, thus widening the spectrum of variants.

10. The palatal realization of the velar fricative is a stereotype, hence not only subject to socio-stylistic variation (at least in certain speakers), but also to overt social comment and sometimes even stigmatization.

One of the features of Moroccan ethnic Dutch is the overlong or geminate realisation of standard Dutch voiced alveolar fricative /z/, although there is no phonemic length contrast in Dutch consonants. Apart from this ethnolectal variant [z:], which is acoustically quite salient, there is an indigenous and equally nonstandard realisation which is voiceless.<sup>11</sup> So altogether three variants can be distinguished: [s], [z] and [z:].

The examples in (1) are taken from recordings of Mohammed, an about 18 year old young man of Moroccan descent; second generation, born and bred in Amsterdam. In this recording, he was chatting with another second generation Moroccan young man of the same age. In three of these cases, /z/ is realized as [z] (standard realisation, as in Q8), in two cases as [s] (the voiceless, regional non-standard realisation, as in Q4) and in one case as the ethnolectal variant [z:].

(1)	<i>variant</i>	<i>preceding</i>	<i>example and glosses</i>	<i>English equivalent</i>
	[z]	V_	die <u>z</u> ocht ik, die <u>z</u> ocht ik that one looked for I	'I was looking for that'
		V_	de <u>z</u> etels the seats	'the seats'
		nas_	in <u>z</u> etten in put INF	'to engage'
	[s]	nas_	gewoon <u>z</u> elf simply self	'simply on your own'
		[-son, -vce]_	ik <u>z</u> al altijd I will always	'I will always'
	[z:]	[-son, -vce]_	op <u>z</u> ich on REFL.3SG	'as such'

Notice that in the last example in (1) the ethnolectal geminate variant [z:] follows a voiceless obstruent, which inevitably undergoes regressive voice assimilation. What occurs far more often is the realization of /z/ as non-geminated [z], following a word ending in a voiceless obstruent, as in e.g.:

(2)	<i>nou moet ik zien,</i>	'now I have to see'
	[ɪgziŋ]	

As such this constellation, i.e. the realization of /z/ as [z] after a voiceless obstruent, which then undergoes voice assimilation, is just as exotic as the overlong [z:], since in indigenous varieties of Dutch obstruent clusters with a fricative in the second position are always voiceless (Trommelen & Zonneveld 1979: 103–104).

11. In many varieties of Dutch fricatives *tutti quanti* are devoiced; cf. the second consideration in 4.2 below.

In sum, in the realisation of Dutch /z/ by people with a Moroccan background there are three things that sometimes strike the ear: voicedness, extra duration, and the regressive [+voice] assimilation to preceding voiceless obstruents. In the realisation of /z/ by indigenous speakers of Dutch, variation merely occurs in the voice specification, so the voiced realisation of /z/ as such is not necessarily exotic.

Does the treatment of [+voice] in the realisation of Dutch /z/, including over-length and spreading to preceding obstruents, have properties of the type of linguistic change that is diffused rather than transmitted? Labov (2007) proposed to distinguish between linguistic change that is diffused through language contact as a result of extragenerational learning (adult L2 acquisition) and internally motivated change that is transmitted and incremented through generational learning, i.e. child L1 acquisition in the interaction between parent and child. Further research is needed to answer this question.

#### 4.1 Actuation

Originally, this [z:] is probably an instance of transfer, more in particular interference from Moroccan Arab (MA) and/or Berber as in Q2.

In MA gemination occurs both lexically and derived. Among the derived geminates the outcomes of morphological (*keddab* ‘liar’ < *kdeb* ‘to lie’, *kassar* break trans. < *kasar* break intrans.) and morphosyntactic gemination must be distinguished. Morphosyntactically conditioned gemination results from passivization (verbal), reciprocity (pronominal) or allomorphy in the definite article (El Aissati 1996: 111–114). All these derived geminates appear to be coronals. In traditional Arabic grammar, coronals are sometimes referred to as ‘sun letters’, after the root for the word for ‘sun’, /ʃms/.

By way of an illustration, the MA definite article will be briefly discussed. The MA definite article, which is prefixed, has three allomorphs:

[l] before a syllable with a single C in the onset:

- (3) a. wəld      lwəld      ‘(the) boy’  
          bənt      lbənt      ‘(the) girl’  
          funduq   lfunduq   ‘(the) hotel’

[lə] before a syllable with a consonant cluster in the onset:

- (3) b. mra      ləmra      ‘(the) woman’  
          Mdi:na   ləmdi:na   ‘(the) city’  
          Kta:b      ləkta:b      ‘(the) book’

and total assimilation in the case of a syllable with a coronal C in the onset, which geminates resultingly:

(3) c.	nur	n:ur	‘(the) light’
	dar	d:ar	‘(the) house’
	sarut	s:arut	‘(the) key’
	zenqa	z:enqa	‘(the) street’

As is to be expected, the ‘Moroccan’ realisation of Dutch /s/ is also sometimes lengthened to [s:], but this variant usually also displays more friction (as a result of more constriction). This extra long and sometimes “sharp” [s:] occurs mainly after segments such as /t/ and /i/ (Van Krieken 2004: 64), i.e. after coronals.

In the various varieties of Berber, geminates occur also in onset position; they have been analysed as tense. Phonetically, the tense – lax opposition is implemented as long – short and at the same time as stop – (interdental) fricative (Otten & De Ruiter 1991: 101).

So it occurs that people with a Moroccan background, independent of the question if they are native speakers of either MA or Berber, have phonological systems in which certain natural classes of consonants can be lengthened. Turkish does not seem to have anything resembling gemination in consonants (neither as such, nor conditionally) and insofar as long consonants occur lexically, they do not do so word-initially. Contrastive voicing does appear to vary in several dimensions in Turkish German, however, and this especially affects /z/ and /s/ (Keim & Knöbl 2007: 167).

A second consideration in connection with the gemination of these sibilants and especially of /z/ in ethnolectal Dutch is a sociolinguistic one. It is based on the observation (in e.g. Van de Velde 1996) that there is a general and very strong tendency towards the devoicing of fricatives in modern colloquial Dutch in a large part of the centre, northwest and north of the language area. Being a final devoicing language (like German, but unlike English), Dutch only has voicing contrasts in the obstruents series in syllable-initial position. As yet, the devoicing of the fricatives is a substandard development – though a persistent and widespread one.<sup>12</sup> Geminating the voiced coronal fricative, /z/, as it occurs in the Moroccan

12. The rapidly spreading voicing of /f/ and /s/ in the numerals for 40, 50, 60 and 70 (‘veertig’, ‘vijftig’, ‘zestig’ and ‘zeventig’, respectively) is probably a hypercorrect reaction to this dialect feature, which has meanwhile made its way into the ‘established’ intermediate varieties and regional varieties of the standard language. Apart from the hypercorrect reaction against the dialectal devoicing of fricatives, which is generally considered as ‘sloppy’, the etymologically ‘incorrect’ voicing of /f/ and /s/ in the numerals may simultaneously result from spelling pronunciation. Cf. Auer & Hinskens (1996: 9–10).

**Table 9.** Some relevant usage-related facts about the voiced fricatives of modern spoken Dutch (< Luyckx et al., ms, 2007)

	Type frequency		Token frequency	
	n	%	n	%
fricatives <i>tutti quanti</i>	46,129	16.53	426,097	14.36
/v/	4,031	1.44	37,373	1.26
/ɣ/	3,418	1.22	29,289	.99
/z/	3,312	1.19	45,919	1.55

ethnolect of Dutch, naturally brings out the voicing much more clearly and might therefore well be a matter of polarization (Hock 1991:428; Taeldeman 2006), i.e. the linguistic manifestation of psychological divergence (Giles et alii 1987) or as an ‘act of identity’ (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1986). Such a reaction would be understandable against the background of the fact that the chances of these groups in Dutch society are getting worse, as was shown in Section 2.2 above.

Thirdly, it does not appear implausible that the variability in the realization of /z/ is ‘boosted’ by the relatively high average token frequency of this particular segment in Dutch, evident in the relevant outcomes of counts on a 9 million word corpus of spoken standard Dutch (collected between 1998 and 2004). Cf. Table 9.

According to Bybee (2001) high token frequency typically leads to reductive change, also in the case of phonemes. In the case of /z/, however, voicing, over-length, and regressive voice assimilation on preceding voiceless obstruents can hardly be considered as results of reductive change. Moreover, reductive change resulting from high token frequency seems hardly reconcilable with the fact that the new, exotic variants of /z/ probably spread via diffusion rather than transmission (Labov 2007), as was hypothesized in the preceding section. If token frequency plays a role indeed, than it may well do so because of the fact that it makes variants which stand out because of extraordinary duration or regressive assimilation of [+voice] to a preceding voiceless obstruent even more salient.

As yet next to nothing is known about the internal conditioning of the [z:] variant of Dutch /z/. Does it also occur before schwa? Is there also gemination in the coronal stops and sonorants? Is the ethnolectal variant socio-stylistically conditioned?

One of the not so many things that are known about this phenomenon is that currently the ethnolectal realisation of the voiced alveolar fricative seems to be spreading to other ethnic minority groups (cf. Q5), just like several other features of the ethnolect of Dutch spoken by Moroccans (or *Mokro’s*, as the Surinamese call them). Dorleijn & Nortier (2006: 48–49) claim that Moroccan Dutch is developing into ‘general ethnic/allochthonous Dutch’ for informal situations, reaching

not only Turkish, but also Greek and Afghan youngsters.<sup>13</sup> It can be added that, if this is indeed the case, then Moroccan Dutch may play a role that is similar to that of Afro-Caribbean, more in particular Jamaican English, in the Manchester area (Sebba & Drayms) and maybe in other English cities.

#### 4.2 A quantitative case study

In order to get a first insight into aspects of this ethnolectally enriched linguistic variable, a quantitative case study was carried out, part of which zooms in on several different dimensions in the distribution of the variant [z:]. For this case study, a total of 220 /z/ realizations by

- two 18 year old males
- of Moroccan and Turkish descent
- raised in Amsterdam

were analyzed. Within the margins set for age, cultural background and city, these two speakers (named Adil and Murat) were randomly drawn from the set of speakers of both groups for whom recordings in all three contact situations were available at the time.

The observations were distilled from recordings of conversations of each young man with

- an 18 year old male speaker of Moroccan descent
- an 18 year old male speaker of Turkish descent
- an 18 year old male speaker of Dutch descent, who has friends among other ethnic groups.

Utterances that were addressed to the fieldworker were systematically excluded. All recordings are part of the corpus that is presently being built for the *Roots of ethnolects* project.

For practical reasons (which pertain to the frequency of occurrence and the amount of data) the analyses have been limited to the realization of /z/ in phonological word-initial position.<sup>14</sup> This set was subsequently confined to the subset of stressed syllables, thus no /z/ occurring in prefixes or proclitic elements were included. This does not mean that the realization of /z/ does not vary in the

13. This system has been referred to as 'Murks', a blend of 'Marokkaans' (Moroccan) and Turks' (Turkish), to indicate the fact that it is spoken by several ethnic minority groups.

14. A phonological word being a terminal node in the syntactic tree; it can consist of a stem plus any adjacent string of cohering ('type I') affixes. Cf. Nespor & Vogel (1986).

**Table 10.** The numbers of occurrence of each variant of /z/; raw figures

Variant	n of occurrences
[z:]	3
[z]	47
[z̤], [s̤]	32
[s]	138
total	220

positions that were excluded from analysis, by the way. As appears from cases such as<sup>15</sup>

- (4) ze wil nou niet      ‘she doesn’t want now’  
       [z:ə]

/z/ can be realised with voice and extra length in a proclitic, preceding schwa. This answers the first question posed in the last part of Section 4.1 above.

The analyzed cases were coded for preceding voiced (vowels, vocoids, sonorants, voiced obstruents) versus voiceless (obstruents) segments. No cases were analysed where /z/ followed either [s] or a pause.

In the remainder of this subsection some of the main results will be briefly presented. Table 10 shows the numbers of occurrence of each single variant.

[z̤], [s̤] concern partly voiceless [z] and partly voiced [s], respectively, i.e. intermediate variants.

The three occurrences of [z:] were broken down for speaker, interlocutor and phonetic context. With respect to the interlocutor, two variables seemed to be relevant: on the one hand the ‘main’ home language (Moroccan Arabic and/or Berber, Turkish, Dutch) and on the other the question whether the interlocutor is a member of the same ethnic minority as the speaker, a member of the other ethnic minority or Dutch.

It turned out that the speaker with a Moroccan background used the overlong variant twice, whereas the speaker with a Turkish background used it but once. As regards the main home language of the interlocutor, overlong [z:] was used in a conversation with a speaker with a Moroccan background once, but twice towards an interlocutor with a Turkish background. As regards the interlocutor’s identity relative to the speaker: overlong [z:] was used twice in a conversation with an interlocutor with the same ethnic background and once towards an interlocutor who is a member of the other ethnic minority group. Not surprisingly, two out of the three instances of overlong [z:] occurred following a [+vce] segment.

15. From data for Mustapha, Moroccan background, 20 years old, born and bred in Nijmegen.

Subsequently logistic regression analyses (method: backward Wald) were run; predictors were the background of the speaker, the main home language of the interlocutor, the interlocutor's identity relative to the speaker and the [vce] specification of the preceding phonetic context. None of the predictors turn out to have a significant impact on the occurrence of [z:] and [z̥], [ʃ], which may be due (among other things) to the relatively small number of observations for these variants. For both [z] and [s] a preceding voiced segment appears to be the only significant predictor;<sup>16</sup> in the case of [z] this factor, which has a positive impact, explains 20.4% of the variance, in the case of [s] this factor, which has a negative impact, explains 13.7% of the variance.

Next, an index (a ratio variable) was created as follows:

$$(5) \begin{array}{cccc} [z:] & [z] & [z̥], [ʃ] & [s] \\ 3 & 2 & 1 & 0 \end{array}$$

The index value 'stands for' the relative amount/duration of the voicing, i.e. the vibration of the vocal cords; it should be plain, however, that the index partly abstracts away from articulatory and acoustic reality.

Acoustic measurements with PRAAT (carried out by David van der Vloed BA, from the university of Utrecht) of four realisations of each variant per speaker,<sup>17</sup> i.e. 1/8 of the total number of occurrences that were transcribed and coded, served to calibrate the transcription and coding. For length, the absolute duration in milliseconds (ms) was used as a measure; it turned out that the duration of 'regular', i.e. non-geminated, [z] fluctuates between 50 and 120 ms; the three overlong [z:] realizations turn out to be considerably longer, up to 296 ms. The relative amount of voicing is the percentage of the total measured duration of the friction accompanied by vocal cord vibration; for the speaker with a Moroccan background the percentages are: [s] 18%, [z̥], [ʃ] 24%, [z] 47% and for the speaker with a Turkish background: [s] 22%, [z̥], [ʃ] 28%, [z] 81%. Although especially for the [z] variant the percentages differ, for both speakers there is a clear monotonic relation, more in particular a positive correlation, between the perceived increase of voice and the measured voice/duration ratio.

The index value in (5) was calculated per speaker per realisation of /z/, per speaker per level of aggregation (e.g. interlocutor, phonetic context) and per level of aggregation. The main level of aggregation concerns the two speakers; their

16. With  $B = 2,386$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .000$  and  $B = -1,244$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = .000$ , respectively.

17. Insofar as they were available, which is obviously only partly the case for the overlong variant.

Table 11. The effects of four independent variables on the index (ANOVA)

Independent variable	Value	Mean index value	F (df)	Signif. effect
speaker	MA / Berber	.62	.083	.774
	Turkish	.59	(1,218)	
main home language				
interlocutor	MA / Berber	.71	2,131	.121
	Turkish	.67	(2,217)	
	Dutch	.44		
relative identity				
interlocutor	same ethn min	.74	2,413	.092
	other ethn min	.63	(1,217)	
	Dutch	.44		
phonetic context	[-vce]_	.27	26,580	.000 ***
	[+vce]_	.85	(1,218)	

overall mean index value is .61 on a scale ranging between 0 and 3. The standard deviation is .86, which is relatively high and points to a high level of variance.

For the index, analyses of variance were run; the main outcomes are summarized in Table 11.

The language background of the speaker has a far from significant effect (.774), so for Murat, the young man with a Turkish background, the relevant non-standard variants of the variable /z/ seem to have reached the status of non-ethnically specific or 'pan-ethnic' features.

For Adil and Murat the main home language of the interlocutor does not appear to affect this linguistic variable, despite the fact that the mean index values show the expected slope. The relative identity of the interlocutor from the point of view of the speaker<sup>18</sup> does not appear to have a significant effect on the index, but there is definitely (what sociologists would call) a trend towards significance ( $.05 < p < .10$ ).

The highly significant effect of the phonetic context is as expected. Adil and Murat's index value after a voiceless segment is striking; in this context [z:] occurred once (out of 3), [z] five times (out of 48), and [z̥], [s̥] 15 times (out of 33). It is revealing to compare these facts to Melvin's (Amsterdam, 'white' Dutch, 18 years old) behaviour; in his conversations with Adil and Murat, Melvin never realises /z/ in the phonetic context [-vce]\_ as [z] or [z̥],[s̥], witness his index value for this context, viz. .00 (N = 28) and in this respect Melvin's behaviour is typical for autochthonous 'white' Dutch speakers of Dutch.

18. I.e. the answer to the question whether the interlocutor is a member of the same ethnic minority, of the other minority at issue or of the originally Dutch majority.

Finally, multiple regression analysis (method: backward) were carried out on the index values. Most remarkably, the analysis brought to light that both phonetic context ( $\beta = .324$ ,  $t = 5.125$ ,  $p = .000$ ) *as well as* the relative identity of the interlocutor ( $\beta = .135$ ,  $t = 2.131$ ,  $p = .034$ ) are significant predictors; together these two factors account for some 12% of the variance ( $R^2 = .126$ ,  $\text{adj } R^2 = .118$ ). So the relative identity of the interlocutor from the point of view of the speaker does appear to have a significant effect on this index for the realization of /z/. From this analysis the relative identity of the interlocutor emerges as the second significant predictor, after the voice specification of the preceding phonetic context.

In the next section, the findings discussed above will be interpreted in the light of the question in the title of this contribution.

## 5. Ethnolect or ethnic style?

First of all, it should be established that after [-son, -vce]\_ the /z/ index for the representatives of both groups has an index value of .27; in this environment indigenous monolingual speakers of Dutch categorically have an index value of .00. In other words, in connection with /z/ following voiceless obstruents there is a clear qualitative distinction between the ethnolectal and the 'white' Dutch phonologies.

The other main finding of the present case study, *viz.* the fact that the /z/ index value in (5) is higher the more identical the interlocutor is to the speaker, seems to be in line with "the focus on the use of Turkish German as a meaningful resource to achieve particular goals in talk-in-interaction" (Kern, this volume). In the realization of /z/ by the speakers in the case study the speakers' ethnicity is not categorically distinctive. Rather, the realization of /z/ turns out to be probabilistically sensitive to the relative identity of the interlocutor (in terms of more or less in-group from the point of view of the speaker) and, not surprisingly, to the voice specification of the preceding segment. Insofar as the micro-social factor is concerned, the variation in the realisation of /z/ appears to be subtly fine-tuned to the audience<sup>19</sup> and serves to project shared identity; it has a stylistic, interactionally relevant function in the sense of recipient-orientation. This aspect of the variation in the realization of /z/ thus seems to be subject to 'strategic' stylistic choices. Very similar findings are reported by Fagyal & Stewart (this volume).

It goes without saying that these findings hold only insofar as conclusions can at all be drawn from the results of a case study for two speakers into one single

---

19. Cf. Bell's (1984) view on style as audience design.

linguistic variable. More or less generalizable claims would only be justified on the basis of the findings for considerably more, randomly selected speakers – preferably *all* speakers in the sample for the *Roots of ethnolects* project ( $n = 96$ ).<sup>20</sup>

Despite the fact that the present contribution is couched within the quantitative tradition, the findings for the micro-social dimension of the relative identity of the interlocutor (preliminary though they are) partly bridge the gap between interpretive ethnographic approaches on the one hand and quantitative language centered approaches to language variation on the other; the gap, in other words, between the study of how people employ linguistic means as tools for non-referential, social goals (cf. Jakobson's 1960 expressive, appellative and phatic functions of language use) and the study of the linguistic means as such; cf. Section 3.1 above.

More in particular with respect to style, variationist approaches such as the ones by Labov (2001), Bell (2001) and Yaeger-Dror (2001) contrast with anthropological views, such as the one by Bauman (2001). Part of the variation in the realisation of /z/ by the speakers in the present case study turns out to be of the 'ethnic style' type and is thus a part of the speakers' verbal repertoires. In Keim's (2006: 79, 80) interpretive approach to ethnolectal variation, which centers around Gumperz' view on communicative social style, style is viewed as a comprehensive and 'weak' concept; styles have a prototype organisation and thus fuzzy boundaries. Styles are not determined; they are continuously being constructed as socially and interactively significant products, as they can be adapted to the situational requirements. A congenial view is taken in Selting (2008), in which the author introduces an approach to style that brings together stylistic analysis and conversation analysis. This view on style also resounds in Thomason (2007), in which it is shown that in interactive exchanges speakers can deliberately modify linguistic forms or even reorganize their language systems; *in extremo* this can lead to drastic linguistic changes, as in the case of Media Llengua and Ma'a, thus Thomason.

Whereas quantitative language centered approaches aim at generalisable insights into the origin and spread of linguistic innovation, ethnographic approaches target at deep interpretive description, typically arguing that the social meaning of language variation is not fixed but rather shifts with the speaker's conjuring up associations with different groups.

Whereas language centered approaches, and in particular the variationist tradition, applies relatively intrusive ways of collecting systematic data, ethnographic fieldwork is less intrusive, but does not usually result in systematically

---

20. This broader study of /z/ and other phonological phenomena is presently being carried out by Linda van Meel MA.

balanced data collections. Neither tradition can rightfully pride itself of working with genuinely natural data, since in both approaches the recorded speakers will typically be aware of the fact that they are being observed and that their behaviour is being recorded or documented otherwise. Another similarity is the fact that in both approaches contextualized language use is studied. In the present contribution this has led to more precise predictions about the situational embedding of the variation in the realisation of /z/.

## 6. Language dynamics and speaker identity

Just like the outcomes of both the convergence across related dialects (koinè's) and dialect-standard convergence (regional standard varieties), ethnolects and ethnic styles

- are in full development, in contrast to the relatively static traditional dialects
- lead to seemingly inextricable jumbles of variation both between and within varieties
- easily lend themselves to social stratification. It is also to be expected that their usage will be limited to specific situations, either from their very emergence onward or gradually
- have no overt prestige, although they seem to enjoy some covert prestige among young people, including 'white' young people.

Dialect use typically carries negative ('hillbilly' etc.) associations; ethnolects seem to be associated mainly with social disadvantage and even backwardness. Why, then, do people nevertheless speak these non-standard varieties? Research has made plain that for the speakers these varieties are totems and a constituting part of their social selves (cf. Bouchard Ryan 1979). Ethnolects seem to be developing into vehicles of ethnic identities, although the group boundaries appear to be permeable and fuzzy.

There is a paradox: for the linguist smooth transitions exist between language varieties, but for the speakers discrete boundaries exist between groups (Herson Finn 1996). In the findings from this case study both can be distinguished. There appear to be smooth transitions (1) on the level of *the speakers*: the fact that the 'Turk' uses the originally Moroccan exotic variants of the /z/ variable, albeit to a slightly lesser extent, and (2) in connection with the effect of the relative identity of the *interlocutor*. A discrete boundary has been established in the phonetic dimension: whereas in the bilingual speakers' phonologies leftward spreading of [+voice] to preceding [-son, -vce] occurs variably, this is categorically blocked in 'non-ethnic' varieties of Dutch.

Analyses of the data for all 96 speakers will ultimately make it possible to determine the differences between the four groups (bilingual Moroccan, bilingual Turkish, monolingual Dutch with strong and monolingual Dutch with weak inter-ethnic ties) as well as to determine if these differences are significant, in other words if they are not due to chance.

## 7. Outlook

In addition to the unanswered questions at the end of Section 4.1 above, there are other questions for further research. As was pointed out above, with respect to the realization of /z/, data will have to be analyzed for all 96 speakers in the *Roots of ethnolects* sample. From the database for the very 96 speakers, data will furthermore be analyzed for 2 or 3 other variable phenomena, among which may well be the realisation of the diphthong /ei/. As soon as these analyses have been carried out, it will be possible to establish the patterns of covariation between the various phenomena, as such and for each of the three contact situations (i.e. speaking with an interlocutor who has a bilingual Moroccan background, an interlocutor with a bilingual Turkish background, and one with a monolingual Dutch background, respectively). If the contact situation has a systematic effect, then different patterns of covariation will hold within each of the three contact situations. In order to establish to which extent bilingual Moroccan, bilingual Turkish and monolingual 'white' speakers of Dutch differ from each other in this and other respects, these analyses will have to be run for each of these groups separately.

Apart from the observations in the database of recorded conversations and elicited language use, further research may also be empirically based on a whole range of different relevant facts, which may be collected with the eclecticism that, according to Auer (1995:427–428), is characteristic of the 'data constitution' (p. 420) of good ethnographic approaches to language. In connection with the *Roots of ethnolects* project, other forms of expression, including material ones such as writing (letters, sms messages and the like), might be particularly useful.

At the same time, ethnolectal variation needs to be studied in connection with social and geographical mobility (as in Carlock & Wölck's 1981 studies among the formerly Polish, Italian and German immigrant communities in Buffalo, New York) as well as a range of social-psychological mechanisms, such as attitude towards the city and orientation towards ethnic identity (as in Kahn's 2006 study among English, Pakistani and Black Caribbean groups in Birmingham, UK).

In the ideal case the findings for, say, 12 year old 'Turks' in Nijmegen can not only be compared with those for 12 year old 'Turks' in Amsterdam, 12 year old 'Moroccans' in Nijmegen and 18 year old 'Turks' in Nijmegen (comparisons

which the *Roots of ethnolects* database will eventually enable in many dimensions), but also with findings for about 12 year old bilingual speakers with a Turkish and Moroccan background in similar cities in Germany, Sweden, England etc. Obviously, international research cooperation (e.g. starting on the level of the family of Germanic languages) could greatly help to unravel internal, external and extra-linguistic forces underlying the development and use of these new non-standard features as well as their diffusion to the verbal repertoires of other cultural groups.

## References

- Androutsopoulos, Jannis. 2001. "‘Ultra korregd Alder!’ Zur medialem Stilisierung und Popularisierung von Türkendeutsch". *Deutsche Sprache* 29: 321–339.
- Auer, Peter. 1995. "Ethnographic methods in the analysis of oral communication. Some suggestions for linguists". In U. Quasthof (ed.), *Aspects of oral communication*. Berlin etc. (De Gruyter), 419–440.
- Auer, Peter. 2003. "Türkenslang? – ein jugendsprachlicher Ethnolekt des Deutschen und seine Transformationen". In A. Häcki Buhofer (ed.), *Spracherwerb und Lebensalter*. Tübingen/Basel (Francke), 255–264.
- Auer, Peter & Frans Hinskens. 1996. "The convergence and divergence of dialects in Europe. New and not so new developments in an old area". In P. Auer, F. Hinskens & K. Mattheier (eds), *Convergence and divergence of dialects in Europe* (= Sociolinguistica 10), 1–30.
- Baker, Philip. 2000. "Theories of creolization and the degree and nature of restructuring". In I. Neumann-Holzschuh & E. Schneider (eds), *Degrees of restructuring in creole languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia (Benjamins), 41–63.
- Bauman, Richard. 2001. "The ethnography of genre in a Mexican market: Form, function, variation". In P. Eckert & J. Rickford (eds), 57–77.
- Bell, Allan. 1984. "Language style as audience design". *Language in society* 13(2): 145–204.
- Bell, Allan. 2001. "Back in style: Reworking audience design". In P. Eckert & J. Rickford (eds), 139–169.
- Bills, Garland. 1976. "Vernacular Chicano English: Dialect or interference?" *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*.
- Bouchard Ryan, Ellen. 1979. "Why do low-prestige varieties persist?" In H. Giles & R. StClair (eds), *Language and social psychology*. Oxford (Blackwell), 145–157.
- Bybee, Joan. 2001. *Phonology and language use*. Cambridge (CUP).
- Carlock, E. & W. Wölck. 1981. "A method for isolating diagnostic linguistic variables: The Bufalo ethnolects experiment". In D. Sankoff & H. Cedergren (eds), *Variation omnibus*. Carbondale etc. (Linguistic research inc.), 17–24.
- CBS, *Statistisch Jaarboek*. 2007. Voorburg/Heerlen (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek).
- Chambers, Jack. 2003. "Sociolinguistics of migration". In D. Britain & J. Cheshire (eds), *Social dialectology. In honour of Peter Trudgill*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia (Benjamins), 97–113.
- Cornips, Leonie. Ms. "The loss of grammatical gender in Dutch. The result of bilingual acquisition and/or an emerging ‘ethnolect’?"

- Danesi, Marcello. 1985. "A glossary of lectal terms for the description of language variation". *Language problems and language planning* 89(2): 115–124.
- Den Besten, Hans & Frans Hinskens. 2005. "Diversificatie van het Nederlands door taalcontact". *Nederlandse taalkunde* 10(3/4): 283–309.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2007. "Stilisiertes Türkendeutsch in Gesprächen deutscher Jugendlicher". In R. Franceschini (ed.), *Im Dickicht der Städte I: Sprache und Semiotik = special issue Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik, LiLi* 37(148): 43–62.
- De Ruiter, Jan Jaap. (ed.). 1991. *Talen in Nederland. Een beschrijving van de taalsituatie van negen etnische groepen*. Groningen (Wolters-Noordhoff).
- De Vries, Jan. 2005. "Indisch-Nederlands". In N. van der Sijs (ed.), *Wereldnederlands. Oude en jonge variëteiten van het Nederlands*. Den Haag (SDU), 59–78.
- Dittmar, Norbert & Daniel Steckbauer. 2007. "Urbane Linguotopie: am Puls der Polyphonie". In R. Franceschini (ed.), *Im Dickicht der Städte I: Sprache und Semiotik = special issue Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik, LiLi* 37(148): 63–88.
- Dorleijn, M. & J. Nortier. 2006. "'Het is een grappige accent, weet je'. Het opvallende prestige van de Marokkanse tongval". *Onze taal* 2/3: 47–49.
- El Aissati, Abderrahman. 1996. *Language loss among native speakers of Moroccan Arabic in the Netherlands*. PhD-thesis, U of Nijmegen.
- Giles, Howard, Anthony Mulac, James Bradac & Pat Johnson. 1987. "Speech accommodation theory: The first decade and beyond". In M. L. McLaughlin (ed.), *Communication yearbook*. Beverly Hills.
- Herson Finn, Viktoria. 1996. *What is Nas? Toward a theory of ethnolect in the south Slavic dialect continuum*. PhD-thesis, Ohio State University.
- Hinskens, Frans. 2004. Nieuwe regenboogkleuren. Jonge typen niet-standaardtaal en hun taalkundig belang. Inaugural lecture, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam. September 24. Electronic version: <[www.meertens.knaw.nl/medewerkers/frans.hinskens](http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/medewerkers/frans.hinskens)>.
- Hinskens, Frans, Peter Auer & Paul Kerswill. 2005. "The study of dialect convergence and divergence: Conceptual and methodological considerations." In Peter Auer, Frans Hinskens & Paul Kerswill (eds), *Dialect change. The convergence and divergence of dialects in contemporary societies*. Cambridge UK (CUP), 1–48.
- Hinskens, Frans & Pieter Muysken. 2007. "The talk of the town: Languages in Amsterdam 1507–2007". In R. Franceschini (ed.), *Im Dickicht der Städte I: Sprache und Semiotik = special issue Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik, LiLi* 37(148): 7–23.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. *Principles of historical linguistics*. Second, corrected and augmented edition. Berlin.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1960. "Linguistique et poétique". chapitre XI in *Essais de linguistique générale*, traduit de l'Anglais et préfacé par Nicolas Ruwet, Paris, 209–249.
- Joubert, Sidney. 2005. "Curaçaos-Nederlands". In N. van der Sijs (ed.), *Wereldnederlands. Oude en jongere variëteiten van het Nederlands*. Den Haag, 31–57.
- Kahn, Arfaan. 2006. *A sociolinguistic study of Birmingham English: Language variation and change in a multi-ethnic British community*. PhD dissertation, Lancaster University, UK.
- Keim, Inken. 2006. "Interaktionale Soziolinguistik und kommunikative, soziale Stilstik". *Sociolinguistica* 20: 70–91.
- Keim, Inken. 2007. "Formen und Funktionen von Ethnolekten in multilingualen Lebenswelten – am Beispiel von Mannheim". In R. Franceschini (ed.), *Im Dickicht der Städte I: Sprache und Semiotik = special issue Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik, LiLi* 37(148): 89–112.

- Keim, Inken & Ralf Knöbl. 2007. "Sprachliche Varianz und sprachliche Virtuosität türkisch-stämmiger Ghetto-Jugendlicher in Mannheim". In R. Salverda & Chr. Fandrych (eds), *Standard, Variation und Sprachwandel in germanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen (Narr), 157–199.
- Kotsinas, Ulla-Brit. 1988. "Immigrant children's Swedish – a new variety?" *Journal of multilingual and multicultural development* 9: 129–140.
- Labov, William. 2001. "The anatomy of style-shifting". In P. Eckert & J. Rickford (eds), 85–108.
- Labov, William. 2007. "Transmission and diffusion". *Language* 83(2): 344–387.
- Le Page, Robert & Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1986. *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge.
- Livestro, Joshua. 2006. *De adem van grootheid – Nederland in de jaren vijftig*. Amsterdam (Bakker).
- Luyckx, Kim, Hanne Kloots, Evie Coussé & Steven Gillis. Ms. "Klankfrequenties in het Nederlands". To appear in *Huldealbum Frans Daems*.
- Muysken, Pieter. Ms. "Ethnolects as a multidimensional phenomenon".
- Nespor, Marina & Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht/Riverton (Foris).
- Otten, Roel & Jan Jaap de Ruiter. 1991. "De Marokkanen". In J. J. de Ruiter (ed.), 91–128.
- Prins, Izak. 1916. "Het Joodsch in Nederland." Review article of van Ginneken 1914, and of Voorzanger & Polak 1915.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London (Longman).
- Sebba, Marc & Susan Dray. Ms. "'Creole' and youth language in a British inner-city community". To appear in Lars Hinrichs & Joseph Farquharson (eds), *Variation in the Caribbean*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia (Benjamins).
- Selting, Margret. 2008. "Interactional stylistics and style as a contextualization cue". In U. Fix, A. Gardt & J. Knape (eds), *Rhetoric and stylistics. An international handbook of historical and systematic research*. Volume 1. Berlin (Mouton de Gruyter), 1038–1053.
- Taeldeman, Johan. 2006. "Polarisation revisited". In F. Hinskens (ed.), *Language variation – European perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia (Benjamins), 233–248.
- Thomason, Sarah. 2007. "Language contact and deliberate change". *Journal of language contact* 1. <http://www.jlc-journal.org> – JLC THEMA 1 (2007).
- Thomason, Sarah & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley etc. (University of California Press).
- Trommelen, Mieke & Wim Zonneveld. 1979. *Inleiding in de generatieve fonologie*. Muiderberg (Coutinho).
- Van de Berg, Marinus & Frank Pieke. 1991. "De Chinezen". In J. J. de Ruiter (ed.), 43–69.
- Van de Velde, Hans. 1996. *Variatie en verandering in het gesproken Standaard-Nederlands (1935–1993)*. Diss. K. U. Nijmegen.
- Van Krieken, Esther. 2004. *Van immigratie tot ethnolect. Een onderzoek naar het ontstaan en bestaan van het Marokkaans Nederlands in Nijmegen*. MA thesis, University of Nijmegen.
- Winkler, J. 1874. *Algemeen Nederduitsch en Friesch dialecticon. Tweede deel*. 's-Gravenhage (Nijhoff).
- Yaeger-Dror, Malcah. 2001. "Primitives of a system for 'style' and 'register'". In P. Eckert & J. Rickford (eds), 170–184.

